

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE CRITERIA
EMPLOYED IN TEACHER EVALUATION

by

THOMAS JAMES MOORE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SEPTEMBER, 1966

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "An Identification and Analysis of the Criteria Employed in Teacher Evaluation," submitted by Thomas James Moore in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

One of the pertinent problems associated with the expansion of education in the past two decades is the evaluation and assessment of teachers, especially in those systems where the assessment represents a condition of promotion to senior positions. The complexity of the task of evaluation of teaching performance associated with the fact that no written guide or check list is provided for inspectors in the system under review prompted an examination of the criteria employed by inspectors in their work of assessment.

In addition to the identification of criteria the study sought to isolate any particular emphasis on product or process, to identify any differences in practice between primary and secondary inspectors and to establish any particular facets of a teacher's performance on which the view of the principal may influence the assessment.

Data for the study were collected from inspectors of schools in the Education Department of Victoria, Australia. Contact was thus made with fifty-four inspectors in the primary division and with twenty-four in the secondary division. Two instruments were used: the first was relatively unstructured and requested inspectors to list the criteria which they used in teacher evaluation. The second instrument was distributed when replies to the first reached the 89 per cent level; this contained a list of thirty criteria and included, following a pilot study, ten criteria in each of Mitzel's categories of product, process and pre-sage. Inspectors were asked to indicate on a scale the extent to which

they used each of these criteria in their evaluation of teaching performance. The critical incident technique was again employed in this instrument to provide data relative to the influence of the principal on evaluation. The data so obtained were subjected to a frequency count for each of a number of purposes; a survey and comparison of responses enabled differences in practice and emphasis to be identified.

This study would indicate that inspectors in Victoria have their own individual rationale as to what constitutes good teaching. In the assessment of teaching performance process criteria were stressed while in the selection of administrators presage criteria received most attention; this may point up the need for specific procedures to be applied to the selection of principals. Little emphasis was placed on product criteria throughout. There were indications that on certain aspects of a teacher's work the advice of the principal should be sought if the assessment is to reflect teaching performance appropriately.

In view of the subjective approach of inspectors and the importance of the assessment to teachers, this study would seem to show the need for the provision of some kind of guide for inspectors; at least those factors which should be taken into account in the evaluation of performance might be indicated. The study would further show that the compilation of such a guide is a practical possibility if based on the criteria identified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In carrying out this study I have received the help and support of a number of people. I am grateful for the opportunity to have studied at the University of Alberta and to have come under the influence of the Head and staff of the Department of Educational Administration. For their faithful completion of the instruments used in the study I appreciate the co-operation of my colleagues, the inspectors of schools in the Education Department of Victoria, Australia. More particularly, for their guidance and advice, I extend my sincere thanks to the members of my committee, Dr. A. W. Reeves, Dr. E. Miklos, Dr. W. H. Worth and Dr. W. D. Neal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. IDENTIFICATION AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction: Importance of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Definition of Terms	3
Background to the Study	3
Nature of the System	3
The Teaching Service	6
The Machinery of Promotion	7
Inspection and evaluation	8
Who makes the evaluation?	9
The headmaster and evaluation	10
Appeals against assessments	11
Functions of the Inspector	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
The Need for Evaluation	16
Who Should Evaluate?	18
Criteria for Evaluation	20
Implications for the Study	23

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	27
Re-Statement of the Problem	27
Collection of Data	29
Source of the Data	29
The Instruments	30
The Nature and Treatment of Data	31
Delimitations of the Study	33
Assumption	34
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CRITERIA	35
Criteria Used in the Assessment of Teaching Performance . .	35
For Promotion to a Classroom Situation	35
Consolidated Common Body of Criteria	41
Criteria Least Frequently Used	42
Criteria Applied to Selection for Administrative Posts . .	45
V. EMPHASIS PLACED ON PARTICULAR CRITERIA	52
Evaluation of Teaching Performance	52
Selection for Administrative Posts	53
VI. COMPARISON OF PROCEDURES IN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DIVISIONS	57
Criteria Applied in the Primary Division	57
Criteria Applied in the Secondary Division	58
VII. THE INFLUENCE OF THE HEADMASTER ON THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE	69
Specific Areas of Headmaster Influence	69

101 The first of these is the

102 importance of the

103 fact that the

104 fact that the

105 fact that the

106 fact that the

107 fact that the

108 fact that the

109 fact that the

110 fact that the

111 fact that the

112 fact that the

113 fact that the

114 fact that the

115 fact that the

116 fact that the

117 fact that the

118 fact that the

119 fact that the

120 fact that the

121 fact that the

122 fact that the

123 fact that the

124 fact that the

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Headmaster and Evaluation	71
VIII. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	74
Summary of the Study	74
Findings	78
Identification of a Common Body of Criteria	78
Isolation of Emphasis Placed on Particular Criteria	82
Primary and Secondary Procedures Compared	84
The Influence of the Headmaster on Assessment	85
Conclusions and Implications	86
Suggestions for Further Study	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
APPENDIX A: Advertisement for Inspector of Secondary Schools	95
APPENDIX B: Instruments Used in the Study	98
APPENDIX C: Criteria Used in the Second Instrument Set out in Categories	110

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Frequency of Mention of Criteria Commonly Used in the Assessment of Teachers for Promotion to Classroom Situations	37
II.	Frequency of Response to Listed Criteria Commonly Used in The Assessment of Teachers for Promotion to Classroom Situations	39
III.	Frequency and Percentage of Responses to Least Frequently Used Listed Criteria	44
IV.	Frequency of Mention of Criteria Commonly Applied to the Selection of Administrators	47
V.	Rank Order of Criteria According to Relative Emphasis Placed on Them in Selections for Administrative Posts	55
VI.	Frequency of Mention of Criteria Applied by Inspectors in The Primary Division	59
VII.	Frequency of Mention of Criteria Applied by Inspectors in The Secondary Division	60
VIII.	Rank Order of Responses to First Instrument in Both Divisions for Criteria Applied to Assessment of Teaching Performance	62
IX.	Frequency and Percentage of Response to Listed Criteria Applied by Inspectors in the Primary Division	63

TABLE

PAGE

X.	Frequency and Percentage of Response to Listed Criteria Applied by Inspectors in the Secondary Division	64
XI.	Rank Order of Responses to Second Instrument in Both Divisions for Criteria Applied to Assessment of Teaching Performance	65
XII.	Comparison of Rank Order of Responses to the Two Instruments For the Primary Division	67
XIII.	Frequency of Response to Various Criteria on Which a Headmaster Could Make More Sound Judgment than an Inspector	72

CHAPTER I

IDENTIFICATION AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION: IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The spectacular increase in school population in the past two decades has focused attention on a number of aspects of administration. One of the pertinent problems associated with the increased number of teachers is that of evaluation and assessment, especially in those systems where such assessment is required as part of the evaluation. In these cases a particular assessment of teaching performance is usually vital to the teacher in that it represents a condition of promotion through the service to the more senior positions. In some instances a check list is provided as a guide for inspectors but in others no theoretical or practical instrument is available.

The evaluation of teacher performance is a particularly complex task; extensive research has emphasized this point rather than providing definite answers to the problems involved. This study was planned to examine and to identify the criteria used in evaluation of teacher performance in one particular system. In any system, however,

. . .The task of identifying effective teachers (or effective teaching) is crucial to teacher education, certification, selection and promotion; and in-so-far as teaching contributes to the total social welfare--to human survival.¹

¹H. E. Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness: Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third edition, 1960, pp. 1481-1486.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study was carried out with a view to ascertaining whether there is any common body of criteria which is used by inspectors in the evaluation of teachers in the State Education Department of Victoria, Australia. In addition to the identification of criteria any particular emphasis on the influence of product or process was investigated. An examination of the criteria used was undertaken, and from this the degree of consistency in approach to teacher evaluation was isolated. This was an important aspect of the study when it is considered that assessments made by individual inspectors are regarded as being consistent by those who nominate teachers for promotion. A further aspect of the study was concerned with the question as to whether there is any marked difference in the approach adopted by primary inspectors when compared with the inspectors of secondary schools. It was also possible to investigate the influence of the Headmaster on assessments awarded to teachers. Much research has been concentrated upon the theoretical development of criteria that could be used in evaluation; the alternative approach used in this study was to determine what criteria inspectors actually use. Some comparison was then made between the two. The main purposes of this study, therefore, were:

1. To establish whether or not there was any common body of criteria applied to the evaluation of teaching performance in the system under review.
2. To establish any particular emphasis placed on the influence of process or product.

3. To identify any marked difference in approach in the primary and secondary divisions of the service.

4. To investigate the influence of the Headmaster on the assessment of teaching performance.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Some of the more significant terms used in the study are defined as follows:

Evaluation. The process of inspection whereby teaching performance and school operation are examined during the inspection of a school. In this study the term generally relates to personnel.

Assessment. This term is used interchangeably with evaluation. It is an extension of evaluation in that the assessment places the teacher in a category as a result of the evaluation.

Inspector and superintendent. These terms are used interchangeably according to the context.

Headmaster and principal. These terms are used interchangeably according to the context.

IV. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Nature of the System

The State of Victoria is 88,000 square miles in area and is by far the smallest of the mainland states of Australia in this respect.

The population of the state is approximately 3,500,000, of which nearly two-thirds live in the city of Melbourne. The school system caters for the whole state and has a highly centralized structure. Currently there are some 2,300 schools, serving 506,000 pupils and employing 32,000 teachers. From this statistical point of view Victoria has the second largest system of education in Australia.

The centralized structure referred to had its roots in the early development of the Australian colonies. The first settlements in Australia were made by convicts from the overcrowded prisons and hulks of England following the unrest and unemployment caused by the Industrial and Agrarian revolutions. The main aim in the mind of the British government was to establish a penal colony, and no arrangements were made for anything approaching a civilian settlement. In this kind of situation little thought was given to the establishment of schools; although some private tuition was supplied, usually by clergymen who accompanied the convicts and soldiers. The pattern thus set persisted for some considerable time, with little variation through the early years of the nineteenth century. The first non-denominational schools were introduced to supplement denominational ones by concentrating on rural areas where no schools existed. Thus, there developed Denominational and National School Boards to control what was at this time something of a dual system and for a time both authorities received government grants.

As the various states separated from the original colony of New South Wales from 1850 on the demand for a universal general education system gained strength. In the sequel the various state legislatures

passed Education Acts that established systems that were free, compulsory, and secular. The Victorian Act was passed in 1872 and under its terms the State Education Department was established.

The major settlements in Australia were made at various points around the coastline and extended inland. In each case the inland settlements found, in these coastal towns, markets and ports for their wool and wheat. Transport and communication radiated from them, stores were obtained from them, and in each state the inland came to depend on the emerging capital city. There was no frontier in the American sense, in fact the word is not used in Australian folklore, rather did people refer to the "outback" which did not mean any point of progress but was an area beyond the boundaries of settlement. Expansion took place not in one general direction away from civilization but radiating in many directions. Because of this all major services became centralized; that is, headquarters were established in the capital cities and local government was not active or effective until this kind of organization was well established. In fact there was little interest in local government until much later. By the time of Federation each state had developed an education system operated by the State Government. In the division of powers set down in the Federal Constitution education remained with the various states.

Within the system of the State of Victoria all major functions are under the supervision of the appropriate officers of the Education Department. The Director of Education is the Chief Executive Officer and is responsible for the administration of the Education Acts;² he in

²An Act to Consolidate the Law Relating to Education (Victoria), No. 6240, Sec. 4.

turn is answerable to the Minister of Education. There are four main bases on which the operation of the system is built. These are:

1. The Education Acts.
2. The regulations made under these Acts.
3. Policy decisions of the Minister and the Director.
4. The Budget--since most finance necessary to the operation of the system is provided from this source.

The Teaching Service

Since 1946 the Teaching Service in Victoria has been separated from the Public Service and is subject to the decisions of the Teachers' Tribunal for salaries and conditions of work. This tribunal consists of a Chairman appointed by the Minister, a government representative and an elected representative of the teachers. The tribunal was established under the terms of the Teaching Service Act of 1946 and is empowered to make regulations under that Act relating to salaries and conditions of work for all members of the teaching service.³ This excludes the Director of Education who, as permanent Head of the Department, is appointed by Cabinet and is a Public Servant. Historically the person appointed to the position of Director of Education is an educator, and up to the time of his appointment, a member of the teaching service having experience in the schools and in senior administrative posts.

Teachers throughout the service are classified into five categories beginning in Class IV and progressing by promotion through Classes III, II, I, and the Special Class. For each class a seniority

³The Teaching Service Act (Victoria), 1958, ss 4-21.

roll is maintained and published every three years by the Committee of Classifiers for each of the three divisions of the service, Primary, Secondary and Technical.⁴ Separate rolls are prepared for men and women in each class; these are used by the relevant Committee of Classifiers to assist them in their duty of nominating teachers on promotion to vacancies in the next higher class. The seniority roll is not the only basis on which these promotions are made.

The Machinery of Promotion

In each division vacancies occurring in any of the classes are advertised in "The Education Gazette and Teachers' Aid." Teachers may then apply for any of the advertised positions in the next higher class, using an official form and setting out the vacancies in order of preference. These applications are forwarded to the Committee of Classifiers for the relevant division and nominations are then made to fill the vacancies.⁵

Generally teachers need to have spent some years in their present classification before having the necessary seniority for promotion; however, this is not the only determining factor. The Committee of Classifiers must have some measure of teacher effectiveness on which to base its decisions. In a centralized system the members of this committee are not familiar with the potentialities of all teachers, hence, some assessment is required. It is the combination of seniority, assessment and the necessary qualifications that enables decisions and

⁴Ibid., ss 29-37.

⁵Ibid. Sec. 48.

nominations to positions to be made. Appeals against these nominations are heard by the Teachers' Tribunal; appeals may be upheld or dismissed, and subsequently the appointments are published by the Tribunal. There is no further appeal against these decisions.

Inspection and evaluation. Current practice is for each school to be inspected annually although the secondary division is experimenting with a system of biennial inspection. Following each inspection a report is submitted to the Education Department; this report is couched in general terms and relates to school organization as well as to teaching performance. In addition each teacher is evaluated and an assessment is made. This assessment does not attempt to make fine distinctions but places the teacher in one of the following four broad categories.

Outstanding: Suitable for accelerated promotion, and in the senior classes for position as Headmaster or for appointment to special positions, for example in Teachers' Colleges or as an Inspector of Schools.

Very Good: Suitable for promotion in turn.

Good: Not yet ready for promotion.

Not Satisfactory: Not suitable for promotion and salary increments within the class are withheld whilst a teacher is so assessed. The teacher is notified of the assessment awarded in due course, and a copy is forwarded to the Education Department. These assessments thus play an important part in the progress of a teacher through the various classes and also determine whether or not he can be considered for

appointment to special positions.

Who makes the evaluation? Inspectors of schools are appointed for each division of the service. When a vacancy occurs or when additional inspectors are needed an advertisement is inserted in the Education Gazette, a government publication which reaches all teachers. The nature of the vacancy and the division in which it occurs are notified and the qualifications required are set out.⁶ From the applications received a special committee makes a nomination and applicants are notified. The special committee is usually under the chairmanship of the Director of Education and consists of the Chief Inspector of the relevant division, the Chairman of the Teachers' Tribunal and the teachers' representative on the appropriate Committee of Classifiers. Those who feel aggrieved at the failure to receive the nomination may appeal to the Teachers' Tribunal. This appeal is heard in person and the nominee is also interviewed; subsequently the Tribunal makes the appointment by disallowing all appeals or by upholding the appeal of a particular applicant. There is no provision for further appeal against this decision.

In the Victorian system the inspector holds a status position in the hierarchy and has two kinds of power: (1) status and authority resulting from the role dimension and which is delegated to the inspector; and (2) the kind of power which must be earned by the incumbent and may be described as achieved prestige and achieved influence. These two

⁶See Appendix A.

are related to Getzels' nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of administrator behaviour.⁷ Depending somewhat on situational factors the inspector may exercise either or both of these kinds of power.

Inspectors in the primary division are assigned to inspectorates both rural and urban and generally reside in their areas, while secondary and technical inspectors are resident in Melbourne and operate as a Board in their respective spheres. Thus, the primary inspector is a generalist inspecting on his own, whilst in the other divisions inspectors operate as teams with specialists covering each subject in the inspection of a school.

The headmaster and evaluation. There are undoubtedly a number of aspects of a teacher's performance which do not show up during an inspection or while his work is being observed in the classroom situation. Such qualities as group orientation, team spirit, general attitude, qualities of leadership, community prestige and the like can best be ascertained by the Headmaster who is able to observe teacher behaviour over a period of time. Many of these characteristics are important influencing factors in relation to the assessment of teachers. For this reason it is the practice on every inspection for a conference to be scheduled between the Headmaster and the inspectors so that these matters may be discussed. Questions are frequently asked by inspectors to bring these matters under review; the Headmaster may make any other comment he

⁷J. W. Getzels, "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review, 22:235-246, Fall, 1952.

deems necessary but generally the inspectors will be impressed to the extent they believe that the Headmaster has carried out a continuing evaluation of his teachers.⁸ No other report on teachers is made by the Headmaster.

Appeals against assessments. Provisions for an appeal by the teacher against his assessment differ according to the procedures adopted in each division. In the primary division the appeal is forwarded to the Chief Inspector of Primary Schools who may adopt one of several courses of action. He may refer the report and assessment back to the District Inspector for review; a Staff Inspector of Primary Schools may accompany the District Inspector on a return visit to reconsider the assessment; if the report and assessment are, in the opinion of the administration, in keeping with the previous record of the teacher the appeal may be disallowed and the teacher so informed.

In the secondary and technical divisions the assessment awarded in the schools is tentative in nature and is not conveyed to the teacher until the beginning of the following year. In the meantime, and after all inspections for the year have been completed, inspectors meet and discuss each of these tentative assessments. This process of revision enables all inspectors in the division to influence the decision and provides the opportunity to compare each teacher with his contemporaries. The assessment resulting from these discussions is then conveyed to the teacher. All appeals lodged by teachers are subsequently heard by the

⁸G. W. Bassett, A. R. Crane and W. G. Walker, Headmasters for Better Schools (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1963), p. 71.

inspectors meeting as a Board under the chairmanship of the Chief Inspector. The decisions arrived at are final and constitute the assessment for the teacher for that year.

Functions of the Inspector

In broad terms an inspector's responsibility may be divided into three major functions: (1) the administrative function, (2) the advisory function, and (3) the assessing function. A study carried out by the members of the Institute of Superintendents of Schools in the Education Department of Western Australia analyzes each of these three questions from the point of view of the basic tasks involved in each, the suggested procedures and techniques that have been found useful in carrying out these tasks, and ways and means of improving professional competence and developing identified skills and knowledge.⁹

In carrying out the administrative function the inspector is concerned directly with people, that is, with teachers and pupils "who are both individuals and members of various formal and informal groups."¹⁰ It is part of the task of the inspector to assist these groups to work more efficiently, to influence their perceptions of their roles, and to facilitate improvements in the physical conditions so that teaching may be more effective.

This attempt in the administrative function to improve teaching performance is taken a great deal farther as the inspector engages in the advisory aspects of his work. The effectiveness of his work in

⁹Education Department, Western Australia, The Functions of a Superintendent of Schools, 1959, p. 2.

¹⁰Ibid.

this respect is revealed primarily in the classroom. This function is performed in a variety of ways: individual and group consultation, seminars, workshops, post inspection conferences, and other in-service activities. In order to carry out this function successfully, the inspector must have a knowledge of group dynamics and of the concept of communication in consultation. The role of the inspector in exercising the advisory function is essentially one of establishing the need for development and of creating the climate in which this development may take place.

No specific job analysis of these two functions was undertaken because this study is primarily concerned with the assessing function as outlined in the Western Australian report. This may also be termed the evaluation function and there is some overlap with the advisory activities for some evaluation or appreciation of the situation must be made before the nature of the advice needed can be ascertained.

Four basic tasks are isolated pertaining to the exercise of the assessing function:

1. To obtain an overview of how well pupils are achieving stated goals in skills, information, attitudes, etc.
2. To assess the principles and processes on which the school is operating to see if they are educationally sound and hence most likely to lead to effective results.
3. To assess teachers to see that they are maintaining adequate standards, and hence, incidentally, that they may qualify for salary increases.
4. To assess the potential of teachers for promotion to positions

of greater responsibility.¹¹

These four tasks may also be regarded as indicating the purposes of evaluation and include evaluation of the school as well as of the teachers. This evaluation and assessment of teacher performance therefore becomes a vital feature of the inspector's work.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 16-17.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In the system under review evaluation and assessment are inevitable; the demands of the system ensure this. The problem of teacher evaluation has been the subject of much enquiry, and there is a wide variety of literature dealing with this aspect of the work of inspection. Much of this is conflicting in nature and serves to emphasize the complexity of the work rather than to provide any definite answers or consistent guide lines. There is little doubt that the task is important; Worcester stresses this when he points out that "there is no job in the schools more important than selecting and evaluating teachers."¹ That it is a complex function is substantiated by Barr who states that no one has developed "a satisfactory working plan or system that can be used by personnel officers who must make judgments about teacher effectiveness."²

Evaluation takes place in two main areas: the school and the teachers. Three of the four basic tasks of the assessing function identified in the Western Australian study show clearly this division of

¹D. A. Worcester, The School Administrator's Problems in Selection and Evaluation of Teachers (Tucson: Bureau of School Services, College of Education, University of Arizona Press, 1962).

²A. S. Barr, "The Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, 22:169-174, June, 1952.

the function. In relation to the evaluation of the school the inspector assesses the "principles and processes on which the school is operating"; with regard to the teaching performance the inspector "assesses the teachers to see that they are maintaining adequate standards and hence incidentally that they may qualify for. . .salary increases," and he also assesses "the potential of teachers for promotion to positions of greater responsibility."³ Thus evaluation and assessment involves both the school and the teaching performance within it. This study was primarily concerned with the evaluation of teaching performance.

I. THE NEED FOR EVALUATION

Apart from the demands of the Victorian system there are other areas and processes to be served by evaluation. In addition to the tasks previously outlined there is, in any system, the necessity for justification of activities and for the expenditure of public money. One approach to the task of evaluation sets down the following areas of concern to be taken into account in assessing the effectiveness of a school:

1. The provisions made for the teaching of the basic skills.
2. The teaching of basic fields of knowledge.
3. The degree to which pupils are taught to think.
4. The extent to which pupil abilities are explored.
5. The emergence of personality and other gross behaviour

³Education Department, Western Australia, The Functions of a Superintendent of Schools, 1959, p. 16.

patterns.

6. The influence of the school on character development.
7. The provision made for the recognition of individual differences.
8. The development of civic competence and responsibility.
9. The provisions made for instruction in Health and Physical Education.⁴

In another look at the problem of school evaluation the same author advocates a detailed study of the instructional program to ensure that it is based on a sound set of principles together with adequate and precise objectives. In the process of evaluation it would be necessary to look for the presence of specific items which confirm the operation of the principle. Other areas in addition to the instructional program worthy of attention are listed as the administrative structure, school staff, and school-community relations.⁵

Morphet further stresses the need for evaluation by pointing out that parents and citizens have a right to know how well the schools are functioning; furthermore, teachers are interested in the results of their efforts. Morphet goes on to point out that evaluation of schools provides a basis or a judgment upon which administrative recommendations and policies are established, continued and revised.⁶

⁴W. D. Neal, "The Characteristics of a Good School--A Research Proposal," The Australian Journal of Education, November, 1958.

⁵W. D. Neal, "The Characteristics of a Good School" (A paper delivered at the Banff Regional Conference of Urban School Superintendents, April, 1964).

⁶E. L. Morphet, R. L. Johns and T. L. Reller, Educational Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959), p. 524.

In support of the contention that evaluation is a necessary and vital aspect of school operation Hicks indicates that

. . .No human enterprise deserves support unless there is some form of demonstrated evidence of its value in the achievement of worthwhile purposes. Since the school is the direct instrument of society depending largely upon public support it is particularly imperative that educators engage in systematic educational inventories which will reveal the nature and degree of the schools' success.⁷

Thus, evaluation is an important function providing a basis for making judgments at the end of a particular period of operation. In addition opportunity is available for diagnosis of difficulties, the testing of new approaches, the conduct of pilot studies and generally to ensure continued effective and efficient operation of the school system. The major justification for evaluation of processes must nevertheless be found in the desire to improve teaching performance.

II. WHO SHOULD EVALUATE?

Worth's study shows that varying interpretations of teaching performance were made by Canadian superintendents after viewing a film of a classroom situation.⁸ It has also been stated that

. . .There is plenty of evidence to show that different practitioners observing the same teacher teach. . .may arrive at very different evaluations; this observation is equally true of evaluation experts, starting with different approaches and using different data gathering devices, they too arrive at different

⁷H. J. Hicks, Administrative Leadership in the Elementary School (New York: The Ronald Press, 1956), p. 405.

⁸W. H. Worth, "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?" The Canadian Administrator, 1, October, 1961.

evaluations.⁹

These varying conclusions may of course be due to some incongruence between the observed behaviour and the expectations of the superintendent.

It has been suggested on occasions that the Headmaster is in the best situation to carry out this function of evaluation. However, in order that the Headmaster does not jeopardize his role as consultant and advisor to teachers it is best that he be not too closely associated with the formal evaluation of his staff. In the opinion of Andrews this should be left to the superintendent.¹⁰ If the Headmaster is too closely involved in formal evaluation he will not be able to act effectively in those areas where his influence is most valuable. Yet he must be sufficiently involved in the function to carry out his administrative duties effectively.

In placing the function of formal evaluation with the inspector the concept of psychological distance is an important consideration. The inspector, may, by virtue of his situation, view the school, its performance and the effectiveness of its teachers from the point of view of one not too closely involved. It is this psychological distance which enables him to make comparisons and to set standards of performance and which places him in the best strategic position to carry

⁹A. S. Barr et al., "Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 30:150-151, September, 1961.

¹⁰J. H. M. Andrews, "The Principal--A Unique Supervisor," The Alberta School Principal, 1959, p. 58.

out evaluation.

III. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Historically "evaluation has been based on every conceivable criterion, technique and individual style imaginable."¹¹ Nichols found that there was variety in the methods employed in the evaluation of elementary teachers in Canadian urban school systems.¹² Techniques have ranged from a detailed check list to reliance on a few fundamental principles. In summarizing the work done on teacher evaluation at the University of Wisconsin, Barr points out that "as yet we do not have an adequate dimension of teaching efficiency and consequently no satisfactory means of measuring this variable."¹³

One attempt to define criteria for evaluation of teaching performance makes the following points in addition to the provision of opportunities for consultation. The teacher would be evaluated in terms of:

1. his contribution to the intellectual, physical and social growth of the class as measured by achievement tests and regular, frequent observation,
2. the degree to which he fits in as a staff member and his contribution to the achievement of group aims,
3. his potential for leadership, organization and administrative duties,

¹¹W. H. Lucio and J. D. McNeil, Supervision, A Synthesis of Thought and Action (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), Chapter 10.

¹²L. Nichols, "A Study of the Methods Used in Canadian Urban School Systems to Evaluate the Efficiency of the Elementary Teachers Employed in these Systems" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1958).

¹³A. S. Barr, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, op. cit., p. 280.

4. his demonstration of certain intangible qualities, for example, sincerity, enthusiasm, interest and self criticism.¹⁴

In 1950 a special committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness was appointed by the American Educational Research Association to take an intensive analytical look at the research on teacher effectiveness. The first report pointed out that there was only one ultimate criterion against which to view a teacher's work and this is the effect on the pupils.¹⁵ This suggests that evaluation in terms of product alone is supported by the committee. On the other hand Rose suggests that two other factors must be taken into account; in his view there are other and related criteria which have an influence on the product. One is the teacher as a person with all his particular characteristics "and the other is the teaching process itself, the way in which the teacher performs to achieve his effects or to fulfill his role."¹⁶ A combination of these two views leads to the kind of general classification of criteria adopted by Mitzel.¹⁷

In addition to the use of criteria inspectors adopt a number of techniques in their observation of teachers. These techniques have been identified on the Australian scene as being:

¹⁴Bassett, Crane, and Walker, op. cit., p. 65.

¹⁵H. H. Remmers et al., "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, 22:238-263, June, 1952.

¹⁶G. W. Rose, Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching, University of Chicago, July, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

¹⁷H. E. Mitzel, infra.

1. to observe the classroom in order to judge the activities which have been carried out and the skill of the teacher in creating a good educational environment,
2. to study recorded evidence of each child's educational progress,
3. to give the teacher a chance to talk about his work,
4. to watch the teacher teaching,
5. to study general questions of organization, including the part played by pupils themselves,
6. to test the class in more or less systematic fashion,
7. to teach the class.¹⁸

The same study developed two broad areas of approach to teaching effectiveness and sought the reaction of inspectors as to whether or not they considered specific detailed aspects of these areas in making their assessments. The major areas involved were technical skills and organizing ability on the one hand and personal factors on the other.¹⁹ Very little consideration was paid to product criteria in this instance although the area was not ignored in the accompanying discussion.

Rose, writing in another context, also defined the three general areas of evaluation developed so far. These he identified as: (1) characteristics of the person (teacher), (2) the performance of the teacher, and (3) the results obtained. He further pointed out that in practice the methods of appraisal followed represent a combination or mixing of these elements.²⁰ This combination of elements is regarded by

¹⁸D. G. Ball, K. S. Cunningham, and W. C. Radford, Supervision and Inspection of Primary Schools (Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1961), p. 116.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 162-163.

²⁰G. W. Rose, "Toward the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, 15:231-238, January, 1958.

Tomlinson as being typical of the more recent studies in teacher evaluation in that emphasis is placed upon determining the specific behaviour of teachers in given situations.²¹

In the extensive literature on the evaluation of teachers there is thus some consensus in that three general areas of concern have been identified in the approach to the problem. These three areas were used in this study as a basis for the categorization of criteria.

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY

Research in the evaluation of teaching has been varied in type and has produced conflicting and inconclusive results. There is an increasing tendency, identified by Tomlinson, to take into account all of the variables in a teaching situation which have a bearing upon the teacher's effectiveness in that attempts are being made to develop more precisely defined criteria.²² Ryans develops the point thus:

Perhaps the first step towards a better understanding of problems relating to teacher competency may be the intensive and extensive study of teacher characteristics. . . .It should not be too difficult to identify teachers who demonstrate these characteristics to a considerable degree. Certainly teachers who were found to rank high--say in the top 20 per cent on a number of sets of teacher characteristics generally agreed to be important in a particular culture could be regarded as being effective teachers.²³

To establish these characteristics in the State of Victoria was the major

²¹L. R. Tomlinson, "Recent Studies in the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Research Bulletin, 34:172-186, October, 1955.

²²Ibid.

²³D. G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960), p. 5.

aim of this study. This approach was taken in spite of some opposition and criticism of the procedure expressed by Anderson and Hunka.²⁴ These authors suggest approaching the problem by investigating variations due to characteristics of the evaluators themselves.

It is sometimes argued that the evaluation of teachers is unprofessional and that, for the most part, it is a most uncertain procedure. There is however general agreement in the literature on evaluation that there must be some starting point, a criterion or standard upon which measurements may be made. It was part of the purpose of this study to identify these criteria in a particular system and to show how one group of inspectors approaches the task of evaluation. It may be that a future study could then test the validity of the criteria identified as to reliability, relevancy, practicability and freedom from bias.

In the examination of the system under review the categorization adopted by Mitzel, but also identified by others, was used.²⁵ It is stressed that in the Victorian system no check list or other written guide is provided for inspectors. The three categories suggested by Mitzel are as follows:

1. Product Criteria. The central theme in this category relates to the changes produced in the students by the teacher. The goals of education are so defined that they may be measured in this way, for instance, examination results are taken as an index of pupil growth.

²⁴C. C. Anderson and S. M. Hunka, "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," Harvard Educational Review, 33:74-95, Winter, 1963.

²⁵Mitzel, op. cit., pp. 1481-1486.

Research reports however indicate that attempts to appraise teacher performance through pupil achievement have serious shortcomings. It is true for example that educational outcomes may refer to behaviour not fully confirmed until many years after schooling has finished. Further, the individual is the product of many forces of which the school is but one; isolating the effects of the school from the effects of other agencies would be virtually impossible. Downey points out that these outcomes are, "at best, very dim and partial reflections of our educational objectives and very doubtful indicators of the effectiveness of teaching and/or learning." Downey goes on to say:

I would contend that, if we are going to continue to use the classical model of evaluation we must be concerned about evaluating all of its components. Testing that part of student achievement which is easily measurable and assuming this to be a measure of the desired outcomes of education is a very inadequate approach to evaluation. For it leaves unanswered more important questions such as: What is the potential of the individual student? . . . What procedures are most effective? And how important are those intangible outcomes which the experts have not yet learned to measure?²⁶

This statement further stresses the importance of not relying on product criteria alone, also it is a near approximation to the categorization suggested by Mitzel and others which is being used in this study.

2. Process Criteria. This category stems from the belief that the processes employed lead to changes in the product; thus the processes are evaluated according to their influence on pupil development. Discipline in the classroom and the methods of instruction employed

²⁶L. W. Downey, "Aims of Education for Today" (A paper delivered at the Banff Regional Conference of Urban School Superintendents, April, 1964).

would be indicative of processes. If this approach alone is used there are also some difficulties in that variation in the processes employed may not result in marked differences in the product.

3. Presage Criteria. This approach seeks to evaluate neither the process nor the product at first hand but concentrates attention upon the personal characteristics of the teacher such as voice, dress, intelligence, manner and the like. Much of the older work in the field of evaluation concentrated in this area, that is, at the level of the teacher as a person; the meager results reported have led to the inclusion of product and process as areas of concern in teacher evaluation.

Each of these categories has some serious limitations if used alone in the evaluation of personnel. On the other hand when used in conjunction they provide an approach to the study of teacher performance. Research has shown the complexity of the teaching function but this complexity has served to encourage a good deal of study. The analysis of a complex performance demands a structure of broad categories into which any part of the whole function can be placed. Thus some recent research has tended towards the development of a structure such as the one adopted by Mitzel which was used in this study.

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

I. RE-STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are two important reasons for the evaluation of teaching. First, the public is entitled to know how well the schools are performing in terms of their objectives. It is necessary to evaluate teaching in order that this information is available. The second reason is related to the improvement of the teaching performance and at the professional level this is the vital aspect; it implies consultation and advice as essential features of the evaluation. As Rose points out, teachers need to know the results of their efforts; they need reinforcement of effective behaviours and assistance in the identification of and the approach to problems. If these are faced openly both in private and in conference the process of evaluation leads to constructive problem solving.¹

In this study it was planned to establish by survey methods the criteria employed by inspectors in Victoria in the evaluation and assessment of teaching performance. The data collected were then analysed to determine whether some common body of criteria could be identified. As no theoretical framework for operation is provided for inspectors the data were further analysed to isolate emphasis placed on any one of the three

¹G. W. Rose, "Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching," University of Chicago, July, 1962." (Mimeographed.)

broad categories of product, process and presage criteria. It was hypothesized:

1. That no such common body of criteria would be revealed.
2. That despite the difference in the situation and circumstances of primary and secondary inspectors, they would use the same criteria in their evaluation of teachers.

There are a number of aspects of a teacher's performance which cannot be accurately gauged by classroom observation, for example, punctuality, team spirit, group orientation and so on. In practice these matters are raised and discussed in conference with the Headmaster during the inspection. These items are particularly important in establishing the total picture of a teacher's performance and information must be sought about them if the assessment is to reflect properly the total contribution being made by the teacher. Data were sought on the influence of the Headmaster and on those criteria where his influence was most likely to affect the assessment awarded.

The study sought to identify and to examine the criteria used by inspectors in the Victorian Education Department in their evaluation of teachers, to isolate any particular emphasis, to determine any differences in practice between primary and secondary inspectors and to establish any particular facets of a teacher's performance which may be closely influenced by the observations of the Headmaster.

II. COLLECTION OF DATA

Source of the Data

The approach adopted in this study was in part suggested by Ryans in indicating the needed research relative to teacher performance. Ryans included in a substantial list two areas of investigation pertinent to this study, namely, an analysis of the opinions of superintendents of schools in relation to teacher effectiveness and the refinement of the observing and assessing techniques employed.²

The data for this study were collected from inspectors of schools in the Education Department of Victoria, Australia. The area of enquiry was concerned primarily with the criteria used in the evaluation of teaching personnel and the extent to which the more continuous observation of the Headmaster is taken into account by inspectors.

In the first instance an approach was made to inspectors by letter explaining the purpose of the study and pointing out that their approach to the problem of evaluation was the focal point. Two instruments were then submitted to all inspectors in the primary and secondary divisions of the Education Department of Victoria. Contact was thus made with fifty-four inspectors in the primary division and with twenty-four in the secondary division. They were requested to complete each instrument independently and were assured that individual responses would be treated in confidence but that consolidated findings would not be subject to this condition.

²D. G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960).

The Instruments

The first instrument distributed requested inspectors to list the criteria used by them in their work of evaluation by reacting to conditions set out in the instrument.³ From the responses it was possible to study the criteria applied in practice to the assesement of teachers for promotion to classroom positions and in addition the criteria applied to the selection of teachers for administrative posts. These responses also provided a basis for comparison with reactions to criteria derived from the literature on evaluation which were presented to inspectors in the second instrument. In seeking responses from inspectors on this first instrument the critical incident technique was employed.

The second instrument was distributed when replies to the first instrument reached the 89 per cent level. This instrument contained a list of thirty criteria drawn from the literature on the evaluation of teachers. The criteria were selected for inclusion on the instrument after a pilot study had been carried out to isolate ten in each of the categories suggested by Mitzel; that is, Product, Process and Presage criteria. In the sum, the thirty criteria bore a close resemblance to those included by Beecher in his Teaching Evaluation Record.⁴ Beecher claimed that his instrument included "all the criterions of effective teaching commonly indicated in the lists of cardinal objectives and pupil needs."⁵

³See Appendix B.

⁴Dwight E. Beecher, The Teaching Evaluation Record (New York: Educators Publishing Company, 1953).

⁵Ibid.

The criteria selected following the pilot study were then included at random on the instrument and inspectors were asked to score each item on a scale indicating A, F, S, or N; thereby showing in respect of each criterion whether it is always used, frequently used, seldom used, or never used by each individual respondent. In addition, the critical incident technique was again employed and inspectors were asked to describe a situation in which their assessment of a teacher was influenced by the comments of the Headmaster and to list those criteria on which they believed the Headmaster could make a more accurate evaluation than the inspector.⁶ Thus the influence of the Headmaster was examined as to whether it was a real factor in teacher assessment and some isolation of the area of influence was possible.

Eighty-nine per cent of all inspectors contacted responded to both instruments; these were the only responses considered in the treatment of the data. It was necessary to send follow-up letters in respect of each instrument before the above level of response was reached.

III. THE NATURE AND TREATMENT OF DATA

The responses to the first instrument consisted of lists of criteria identified by inspectors as the ones which they used in the assessment of teachers for promotion to classroom situations and for the selection of teachers for administrative posts. From these responses it was possible to consolidate for each situation the criteria most

⁶See Appendix B.

frequently used. This was done by a frequency count; criteria which were listed 70 per cent of the time were regarded as being used sufficiently frequently to be included in the common body for each of the situations involved. It was not difficult to express these criteria in the same terms as those adopted in the second instrument for purposes of comparison.

The responses to the second instrument took the form of reactions to listed criteria drawn from the literature and tested for validity in a pilot study. By a frequency count it was again possible to isolate the criteria most commonly employed by inspectors. Again, for a criterion to be included in the consolidated list, 70 per cent of the respondents included it as always being used by them in the evaluation of teachers. Attention was also given to any criteria listed by inspectors which did not appear on the instrument. On the second instrument these were found to be too few to be significant.

It was then possible to compare the two consolidated lists of criteria and by so doing to develop a composite body, from practice and literature and consistent with both, which may provide a framework within which evaluation may be more effectively made. If such a guide--not a check list--were available to inspectors it may help to prevent "global" ratings being made without consideration of the contributing factors. This might result in improving the effectiveness of the evaluation procedure by facilitating the process of synthesis.

By re-sorting the criteria on both instruments into Mitzel's three categories it was possible to detect whether inspectors emphasize

any particular approach or aspect of the teacher's work in making their evaluation; that is, whether any identifiable emphasis is placed on product, process or presage criteria.

By a survey and comparison of the responses from primary and secondary inspectors it was possible to determine whether there was any marked difference between the criteria employed by inspectors in one division in relation to those employed in the other. Some investigation of these differences in relation to the particular circumstances was undertaken.

It has been established that there are some aspects of a teacher's work which must be taken into account when making an assessment and which are best known to the Headmaster. The data obtained from the second instrument showed the degree to which the Headmaster became involved in the assessment and also identified those areas on which inspectors were most likely to be influenced by him.

The main purpose of the study remained as an attempt to identify how one group charged with the duty of evaluation and assessment of teachers approaches its task; but from the data obtained it is possible that some subjective judgments and speculations may also be made relating to the problem.

IV. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study was delimited to the procedures applied in the State Education Department of Victoria, Australia.

2. The field from which the data were gathered was delimited to inspectors of the primary and secondary divisions of this Department.

Inspectors in the Technical Schools Division were excluded from the study because of the particular nature of their work.

3. The study was delimited to the extent that data were sought from inspectors with one full year of experience or more.

4. The study was delimited to the evaluation of teaching personnel. While some Headmasters are assessed by inspectors this assessment is not based on teaching performance, and they were, therefore, excluded from this study.

5. Only teachers permanently employed in the service of the Education Department receive copies of their assessments; thus, the study was delimited to the procedures adopted in the evaluation of these teachers.

V. ASSUMPTION

It was assumed that the responses made by inspectors represented a true reflection of their practices as exercised in the evaluation of teachers.

CHAPTER IV

IDENTIFICATION OF CRITERIA

In the collection of data on the first instrument the critical incident technique was employed and respondents were required to react to the assessment of a teacher for promotion to a classroom situation and separately for promotion to an administrative post. In some instances responses were couched in terms that were rather too general to be of much value to the study, but generally it was found possible to match the criteria listed with the specific statements of criteria contained on the second instrument. This enabled comparisons to be made between the responses to the two instruments employed; due regard was paid, however, to any criteria that could not be so matched when the data were being considered. In the second part of the survey such criteria were disregarded when it was shown that they did not occur with sufficient frequency to merit consideration.

I. CRITERIA USED IN THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

For Promotion to a Classroom Situation¹

The central purpose of the study was to establish whether a common body of criteria was employed by inspectors in Victoria. For a criterion to be included in any isolated common body the condition was imposed that it should be listed by 70 per cent of the respondents. At

¹"Classroom situation" is used to denote a teaching rather than an administrative post.

this stage only the total responses were considered, differences which emerged between primary and secondary inspectors were considered separately. In Table I the criteria which satisfied the conditions for inclusion in a common body applied by inspectors to the assessment of teachers for promotion to classroom situations are listed. They are set out in the table in the same terms as the criteria listed on the second instrument.²

All other criteria listed by respondents to Part 1 of the first instrument did not reach even the 60 per cent level. Thus only three criteria could be classed as representing a common approach made by inspectors of both divisions. It would appear that only over a small area of teacher performance is there agreement among inspectors as to the factors to be taken into account when making an assessment. Considering that only on three criteria is there more than 70 per cent agreement it is reasonably concluded that the hypothesis that no common body of criteria would be revealed is supported by the data obtained from the first instrument. Even when the cut-off point is reduced to 60 per cent of the responses, only five criteria can be included as representing the common body sought. In this aspect of the study the inspectors' own lists of criteria were being considered and the fact that no real area of agreement in the approach to the assessment of teaching performance was revealed may indicate the need for the provision of some form of guide for inspectors.

When data derived from the second instrument were considered with

²See Appendix B.

TABLE I

FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA COMMONLY USED IN THE ASSESSMENT
OF TEACHERS FOR PROMOTION TO CLASSROOM SITUATIONS

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Methods of lesson presentation used	70	100
Lesson preparation and planning	61	87
Teacher-pupil relationships	53	76
Class control	44	63
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	42	60

a view to isolating a common body of criteria the same selection procedures were applied. That is, for inclusion in a common body it was required that a criterion be scored at A (always used) on the scale in at least 70 per cent of the cases. Under these circumstances and considering total responses the second instrument provided the information set out in Table II.

With respect to this instrument it was possible to identify eleven criteria which satisfied the conditions for inclusion in a common body and which therefore represented a common approach to the task of assessment. The validity of the thirty criteria listed on the second instrument as those most commonly used was tested in a pilot study and general agreement was reached.³ When these criteria were presented to inspectors and responses sought there was agreement over a much wider area than was the case when they were asked to identify and to list criteria on the relatively unstructured first instrument. In this case therefore it was possible to identify a common body of criteria applied to the assessment of teacher performance. It is reasonable to assume from this that the criteria so identified are considered by the inspectors to be fundamental to good teaching. Further, the criteria listed represent the area of agreement among inspectors as to what constitutes good teaching.

With reference to the failure of the data to reveal such a body from the first instrument it is reasonable to conclude that inspectors

³Dwight E. Beecher, The Teaching Evaluation Record (New York: Educators Publishing Company, 1953).

TABLE II

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO LISTED CRITERIA COMMONLY USED IN THE
ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS FOR PROMOTION TO CLASSROOM SITUATIONS

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Class control	68	97
Teacher-pupil relationships	66	94
Pupil participation in lessons	64	91
Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self reliance	58	83
Lesson preparation and planning	56	80
The personality of the teacher	56	80
Energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	52	74
Supervision and checking of written work	52	74
The teacher's standing with the pupils	51	73
The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	50	71
The attitude of pupils to the school and to authority	50	71

approach the task of assessment in a variety of ways, that is, the approach is a subjective one particularly when inspectors are asked to set down their own view of the task in response to an unstructured instrument. Differences or variations in the assessment of teacher performance as revealed by Worth⁴ and others may thus be due to this fact, that is, the lack of a common approach and the absence, in the system under review, of any kind of check list or guide for inspectors in their evaluation of teacher performance. Some important questions are raised by this situation which are partly answered by the data available; for example, do some inspectors recognize only three or four criteria in their observation of teachers? Do they become aware of others only when pressed to consider them as was the case with the second instrument? If this is so, then it might be reasonable to assume that a good many assessments are made on limited information, not on the total teaching performance. It could be speculated that there might be a substantial "halo" effect in such assessments in that because a teacher performs well in respect of a few criteria he is judged to be effective in so far as his total performance is concerned. This emphasises the importance of establishing adequate procedures for the selection and training of those who are to be charged with this duty of assessment in the Victorian system.

From the data obtained it would be reasonable to conclude that each inspector has his own interpretation of what constitutes good

⁴W. H. Worth, "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?" The Canadian Administrator, Vol. I, No. 1, October, 1961.

teaching and bases his evaluation of performance on this. Thus, further emphasis is placed on the problem of constructing a suitable check list and additionally on the validity of check lists wherever they are used. The development of such a list which would meet with consensus among inspectors of the system under review could well be the basis of further study in the matter of teacher evaluation. From the data obtained on the first instrument in this study there would be insufficient consensus among inspectors for them to construct such a list. On the other hand, if criteria are tested for validity in a pilot study and subsequently presented to inspectors they could isolate an area of agreement which could form the basis of a written guide for inspectors indicating at least those aspects of a teacher's total performance which should be taken into account when assessments are being made.

Consideration of the data obtained from the first instrument leads to the conclusion that inspectors make an individual and personal approach to assessment and emphasises the difficulty of isolating those characteristics generally agreed to be symptomatic of good teaching.⁵ Thus, further evidence is provided for the need to stress selection and training procedures for inspectors rather than attempt to measure objectively the characteristics of good teaching performance.

Consolidated Common Body of Criteria

If the responses to both instruments are considered in an attempt

⁵D. G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960).

to identify a common body of criteria, that is one derived from practice and from the literature and consistent with both, only a small area of agreement is reached. Only five criteria meet the requirements for selection due to the wide diversification of responses to the first instrument. When the cut-off point is lowered to 60 per cent, a further three criteria could be included. Thus, the hypothesis that no common body of criteria on teacher assessment would be revealed by the data is supported when responses to both instruments are considered in conjunction. The combined responses would indicate that the following criteria represent the area of agreement; that is, they were responded to at least 70 per cent of the time:

1. Teacher-pupil relationships.
2. Lesson preparation and planning.
3. The methods of lesson preparation used.
4. Class control.
5. Pupil participation in lessons.

The three criteria that could be added when the cut-off point is lowered to 60 per cent would be:

6. Concern with the all-round development of the pupils.
7. The personality of the teacher.
8. The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching.

Criteria Least Frequently Used

Further consideration of the data revealed that there were many criteria which received relatively few responses. There was, however, some agreement on these both with respect to each instrument taken

separately and also when total responses to both instruments were considered. In this latter case the following criteria would be revealed as being least used by inspectors:

1. The level of intelligence of the teacher.
2. The professional activities of the teacher.
3. The teacher's participation and standing in the community.
4. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility.
5. The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed.
6. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards.
7. The dress and appearance of the teacher.
8. Concern with the character development of the pupils.

When an analysis is made of these criteria it is revealed that four of them are presage criteria relating more particularly to the personal qualities of the teacher as being predictive of teaching performance. It is significant that criteria in this group do not show up in full under inspection and are among those upon which inspectors seek additional information from the Headmaster as was revealed in a later analysis of the data. In Table III the criteria least frequently used as revealed in the response to the second instrument are presented. Of the ten criteria listed in the table, four are presage criteria, five are product and only one is drawn from the process group. The difficulty of assessing teaching performance on product alone is emphasised here and the shortcomings of this approach are again indicated by the fact that one-half of the criteria least frequently used come from this group. This analysis of the data would further indicate that the assessment is made on a rather limited view of the teacher's total performance,

TABLE III
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO LEAST FREQUENTLY
 USED LISTED CRITERIA

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	7	10
The professional activities of the teacher	7	10
Examination results	10	14.3
The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	14	20
The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	14	20
The pupils work well without supervision	16	22.9
The level of intelligence of the teacher	17	24.3
The personality of the teacher	18	25.7
The use of teaching aids	23	32.9
The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	25	35.7
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	29	41.4

namely, the processes which he employs in the classroom, and from these inferences are drawn about other aspects of his work. In other words, there appears to be a considerable "halo" effect in the making of the final assessment awarded to a teacher. Added to this there is a likely carrying forward of the "halo" effect from knowledge gained of assessments of particular teachers in previous years. More particularly it is surprising that the extent to which a teacher engages in the evaluation of the processes he employs is among those criteria least frequently used in the assessment of teacher performance. There could be a number of reasons for this; in the system under review the time spent on inspection is rather brief, the inspector is pre-occupied with the observation of classroom performance and of the need to make an assessment, and there is little opportunity to discuss at length any evaluation or examination a teacher may make of his own techniques. These matters are not entirely neglected but the time available to spend on them is limited.

II. CRITERIA APPLIED TO SELECTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS

It was part of this study to ascertain whether or not inspectors applied any specific criteria to the selection of teachers for promotion to administrative posts as Headmasters or Inspectors of Schools and similar positions. The inspectors contacted in the study were asked on the first instrument to list the criteria which they applied to this aspect of their work. In their responses a number of inspectors in the primary division pointed out that in that division there was no specific

selection of a teacher for a particular post. For example, if a teacher receives an assessment of "Very Good" or "Outstanding" he is regarded as being promotable to any position in the next higher class. This would include appointment as a Headmaster. Although an "Outstanding" assessment would be required for appointment as an Inspector of Schools, no specific attempt is made to select for such positions through the assessment. Nevertheless, many inspectors in the primary division listed criteria they would apply to the selection of Headmasters were they required to do so.

In the secondary division, on the other hand, a deliberate attempt is made at the appropriate level to select teachers for promotion as Headmasters; an "Outstanding" assessment is required in the previous class before a teacher is considered for appointment as a Headmaster. At this level the assessment is not so much concerned with teaching ability as with evidence that a teacher could administer a school, although as is revealed in Table IV, teaching ability is still an important factor. This indicates that inspectors believe that administrators in education must be drawn from the ranks of the best teachers.

When the reactions to the first instrument were considered there were fewer overall responses to this section due to the failure of many primary inspectors to list criteria because of the conditions obtaining in that division. Little difference in emphasis was revealed between the two divisions in this aspect of the study; in fact, after consideration of all responses either in divisions or taken together the same list of criteria could be identified. This would seem to indicate that

TABLE IV
 FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA COMMONLY APPLIED TO THE SELECTION
 OF ADMINISTRATORS^a

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	58	100
The personality of the teacher	47	81
The methods of lesson presentation used	43	74
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	42	72.6
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	40	69
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	37	63.8
The professional activities of the teacher	35	60.5

^aFifty-eight responses were received to this question.

inspectors are in stronger agreement on the criteria to be applied to the selection of administrators than they are on the assessment of teaching performance. It is possible that the global assessments obviously made in relation to classroom performance may be more reliable than consideration of the parts on which there is a wide personal divergence among inspectors. It is significant that a number of inspectors in commenting on the study pointed out that there was a "wholeness" about the teaching performance which is more than just a sum of the many aspects of the teaching function. The criteria which make up the "parts" for individual inspectors differ considerably; some inspectors use a good many facets and others only a few. Those who use only a few are probably judging on limited evidence and their assessments are subject to a considerable "halo" effect. This matter is referred to again in Chapter VIII.

As previously pointed out there were fewer respondents to this section of the instrument but there was a reasonable area of agreement on the criteria listed in Table IV. The criteria listed in this table formed a distinct group quite apart from all the rest, for example, the next in line of importance to inspectors received only twenty-two responses while for seven of the criteria listed on the second instrument there were no responses at all. These were:

1. The pupils work well without supervision.
2. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils.
3. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility.

4. Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance.
5. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards.
6. The training of pupils in self-expression.
7. The use of teaching aids.

Consideration of these seven criteria reveals that six of them fall within the product group and the other is concerned with the processes employed. From this it could be concluded that little consideration is given to product when administrators are being selected. Also, from the information contained in Table V it can be concluded that in the selection of administrators presage criteria are vitally important and these, together with competent lesson presentation, provide the basis for the selection of teachers for administrative posts.

It would be reasonable to conclude that inspectors approach the task of assessment in a completely individual way and after consideration of their own listing of criteria no common body or common approach could be identified. Assessments are thus made on a global basis with little real consideration of the component parts. A further study could well be based on this issue. Variations in assessments made of the same teacher by different inspectors are thus caused by differences in the approach made by individual inspectors; this would be in-line with the suggestions made by Worth.⁶ Again emphasis is directed towards the procedures applied to the selection and training of those who must make assessments of teaching performance.

The kind of scale upon which teachers are assessed also emerges

⁶Worth, op. cit.

as a vital factor. Global assessments may well be effective in placing teachers in a group, say on a four-point scale, as is used in the system under review. The more divisions on the scale, the greater the difficulty experienced by inspectors in arriving at an assessment; the finer the scale, the more subjectivity becomes involved. This raises the question as to whether it is possible or even desirable to measure teaching performance quantitatively. Teaching is without doubt a complex function, and since it is evaluated by individuals there will be variations due to personal views and ideas. For the present, therefore, stress must be placed on the professional training and background of those charged with this task.

On the other hand, when presented with a list of previously tested criteria, inspectors found no difficulty in isolating a common body; presumably because on this instrument their attention was specifically directed to the various aspects of teaching performance. When such agreement is reached in a structured situation and yet is impossible otherwise it could well be an indication of the need for some kind of written guide or check list to be provided for inspectors. This would tend to ensure that the factors identified in the study as being indicative of good teaching would be taken into account when making an assessment.

The general agreement reached on criteria for selection for administrative posts may well be explained by the fact that this is a narrower assessment. It may also be that inspectors see more clearly the criteria for selection for administrative posts than they do those

relating to good teaching performance. Again, the nature of the task is different in that the role is now one of leadership involving specific skills. The stress placed on presage criteria (see Table IV, page 47) shows that personality factors together with sound teaching performance provide the basis for selection of teachers for administrative posts. This is recognition of the necessity for the technical-educational skill and a skill in human relations.⁷ Other skills of an effective administrator could well be revealed in other criteria applied to assessment of teaching performance and in information gained from an interview with the Headmaster.

⁷L. W. Downey, "The Skills of an Effective Principal," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, No. 3, December, 1961.

CHAPTER V

EMPHASIS PLACED ON PARTICULAR CRITERIA

I. EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

It was part of this study to ascertain whether or not inspectors placed any identifiable emphasis on any one of the three broad categories of criteria as expressed by Mitzel.¹ Data for this part of the study were taken from the responses to the second instrument. The selection of thirty criteria as included on this instrument resulted in ten criteria from each group--product, process and presage--being presented to inspectors for their consideration. When the instrument was presented to inspectors the criteria were included at random; for isolation of emphasis on any particular group they were re-sorted into the three groups.

In analysing the data criteria marked A (Always Used) on the second instrument were the ones considered and these responses were then placed in rank order so that any emphasis could be identified. When this was done it was revealed that numbers 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 in the rank order appeared under process criteria; number 4 was in the product group and number 5 in the presage group while the other four process criteria appeared at numbers 13, 14, 22, and 23 in the rank order. When the responses to both instruments were consolidated and these total responses placed in rank order it was found that numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,

¹H. E. Mitzel, "Teacher Effectiveness: Criteria," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, 1960, pp. 1481-1486.

8, and 11 in the rank order appeared in the process group; the other two process criteria appeared at numbers 24 and 26 in the rank order. This analysis of the data would indicate a strong emphasis on process criteria in the evaluation of teaching performance. The neglect of the other two groups leaves some room for speculation here; do inspectors evaluate teachers against their own objectives and what relationship do these bear to the objectives of the teacher? Alternatively, it may be that the objectives used in evaluation are not known to the teachers who are thus forced to adopt patterns of behaviour which they assume inspectors favour. The fact that inspectors are not much concerned with product could indicate that they are not much concerned with objectives and this could increase the insecurity of the teachers. This attitude could also reflect upon the readiness of the teacher to adapt programs and to carry out experiments in the classroom. It could be speculated that some unfavourable assessments are the result of some incongruence between the observed teacher behaviour and the expectations of the inspector; this could be due to failure of both parties to place sufficient emphasis on objectives.

II. SELECTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS

It should be borne in mind in this section of the study that in the primary division no specific attempt is made to select administrators through the assessment. In general a promotable mark means eligibility for promotion to any position in the next higher class which may be to a Headmaster's post or to a classroom situation. In the

secondary division, as previously indicated, there is an attempt to use the assessment to select teachers for administrative posts.

Data were collected on this aspect of the study on Part B of the first instrument; thus they represent the inspectors' unstructured listing of the criteria employed in this aspect of their work. Because of the situation which obtains in the primary division fewer responses were available for consideration. The criteria listed by inspectors were readily matched with those included on the second instrument; this was done throughout the study to give uniformity of expression.

Examination of the data revealed that in the selection of teachers for administrative posts inspectors place considerable stress on presage criteria. When the responses were arranged in rank order according to frequency of mention numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 were found in the presage group, while number 3 was included in the process group. The strong emphasis placed on this group of criteria in selecting for administrative posts is shown in Table V.

All product criteria and other process criteria received very few responses, and in point of fact a number of criteria received no responses at all concerning this aspect of the study. Reference to Table IV, p. 47, shows that agreement on common ground applied to the selection of teachers for administrative posts bears a close relationship to this aspect of the study.

With relation to the attempt to identify any stress placed on the groups of criteria it can thus be concluded that in the assessment of teaching performance the process criteria are of paramount importance

TABLE V

RANK ORDER OF CRITERIA ACCORDING TO RELATIVE EMPHASIS PLACED ON THEM
IN SELECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE POSTS

Criteria	Number of Responses	Rank Order
Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	58	1
The personality of the teacher	47	2
The methods of lesson presentation used	43	3
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	42	4
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	40	5
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	37	6
The professional activities of the teacher	35	7
The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	22	8

whereas in the selection of administrators the presage group is emphasized. Certain exceptions to this general statement have been indicated.

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF PROCEDURES IN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY DIVISIONS

It was hypothesized that in spite of the different situation and circumstances of primary and secondary inspectors, they would apply the same criteria to the assessment of teachers. Primary inspectors work as individuals within a prescribed district whereas in the secondary division inspectors are subject specialists and work with one another. Generally in this division two inspectors are concerned with the formulation of the tentative assessment.

In this aspect of the study only those responses relating to the assessment of teaching performance were considered. Data were not analysed relating to the approaches made to selection for administrative posts in each division due to the fact, previously noted, that in the primary division a promotable assessment means eligibility for promotion to any position in the next higher class providing that other conditions are also satisfied. That is, in this division no attempt is made to select administrators through the assessment. Hence in consideration of criteria applied in each of the two divisions only those relating to the assessment of teaching performance were considered.

Criteria Applied in the Primary Division

Considering the first instrument alone, that is, inspectors' own lists of criteria applied by them to the assessment of teachers, it was

found that only four criteria were listed more than 70 per cent of the time, but eight criteria were listed by more than one-half of the forty-nine respondents from the primary division. These are set out in Table VI and further indicate the emphasis placed on process criteria when assessing teaching performance. In fact when placed in rank order according to frequency of response the first four, and the only ones to meet the 70 per cent requirement, are process criteria. A comparison of rank orders in the two divisions on the first instrument is shown in Table VIII, p. 62.

Criteria Applied in the Secondary Division

In the secondary division there were fewer responses because of the number of inspectors involved. For this division the same procedure was applied and again some emphasis on process criteria was revealed. While there was some difference in the actual criteria stressed there was still considerable emphasis placed on the process group. The particular differences revealed could be caused by the nature of the work in each division; primary inspectors being generalists looking at all subjects of the curriculum while secondary inspectors are subject specialists only rarely being called upon to work outside their own particular specialty. The criteria employed by the secondary inspectors are set out in Table VII, p. 60.

Consideration of the responses to the first instrument thus revealed quite distinct differences in the criteria applied by inspectors in each division although in both instances process criteria were emphasized. This further suggests that inspectors view the work of

TABLE VI
FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA APPLIED BY INSPECTORS
IN THE PRIMARY DIVISION

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
The methods of lesson presentation used	49	100
Lesson preparation and planning	48	98
Teacher-pupil relationships	42	85.7
Class control	36	73.4
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	28	57.1
The personality of the teacher	27	55.1
Examination results	27	55.1
Pupil participation in lessons	26	53

TABLE VII
 FREQUENCY OF MENTION OF CRITERIA APPLIED BY INSPECTORS
 IN THE SECONDARY DIVISION

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
The methods of lesson presentation used	21	100
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	20	95.2
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	13	61.9
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	12	57.1
Supervision and checking of written work	11	52.4
Teacher-pupil relationships	11	52.4
Pupil participation in lessons	11	52.4
Lesson preparation and planning	11	52.4

assessment as individuals with consequent variation in emphasis as revealed in this and in the earlier examination of the data. Rank order responses for the secondary division in response to the first instrument are included in Table VIII.

When the more structured responses to the second instrument were considered a similar situation was shown to exist; again there was general emphasis on the process group of criteria and particular emphasis within this group indicated a similar variation. This is shown in Tables IX and X, pp. 63 and 64. In Table XI, p. 65, rank order responses on the second instrument are set out for the two divisions.

In relation to the hypothesis that inspectors in each division would use the same criteria in their evaluation of teachers the examination of the data would show that while in general terms there is common stress placed on the process group, the hypothesis is not shown to be supported because of considerable difference in emphasis on particular criteria within this group. Throughout the whole examination of data surprisingly little stress was placed on the product group; this point has been previously noted and discussed (see page 53).

Consideration of the information contained in Tables IX and X and derived from the data gained from the second instrument shows that a much more definite and clear-cut response was obtained than was the case with the first instrument. This is regarded as an indication that inspectors are better able to express their approach to the assessment of teaching performance when some structure is provided and is further evidence for the need for the provision of some kind of guide or

TABLE VIII

RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES TO FIRST INSTRUMENT IN BOTH DIVISIONS FOR
CRITERIA APPLIED TO ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Criteria	Rank Order Primary	Rank Order Secondary
The methods of lesson presentation used	1	1
Lesson preparation and planning	2	8
Teacher-pupil relationships	3	6
Class control	4	
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	5	18
The personality of the teacher	6	19
Examination results	7	12
Pupil participation in lessons	8	7
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	9	2
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	12	3
Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	11	4
Supervision and checking of written work	19	5

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TO LISTED CRITERIA APPLIED BY
INSPECTORS IN THE PRIMARY DIVISION

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Class control	49	100
Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self reliance	46	93.9
Teacher-pupil relationships	46	93.9
Pupil participation in lessons	44	90
The attitude of pupils to the school and to authority	42	85.7
Provision made for individual differences and group needs	40	81.6
The personality of the teacher	39	79.6
Supervision and checking of written work	39	79.6
Concern with the all-round develop- ment of the pupils	39	79.6
Lesson preparation and planning	37	75.5

TABLE X

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TO LISTED CRITERIA APPLIED BY
INSPECTORS IN THE SECONDARY DIVISION

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
Pupil participation in lessons	20	95.2
Teacher-pupil relationships	20	95.2
Lesson preparation and planning	19	90.5
Class control	19	90.5
The methods of lesson presentation used	19	90.5
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	17	81
The personality of the teacher	17	81
The teacher's standing with the pupils	17	81
Supervision and checking of written work	13	61.9
The training of pupils in self-expression	13	61.9

TABLE XI

RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES TO SECOND INSTRUMENT IN BOTH DIVISIONS FOR
CRITERIA APPLIED TO ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Criteria	Rank Order Primary	Rank Order Secondary
Class control	1	4
Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self reliance	2	12
Teacher-pupil relationships	3	2
Pupil participation in lessons	4	1
The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	5	16
Provision made for individual differences and group needs	6	28
The personality of the teacher	7	7
Supervision and checking of written work	8	9
Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	9	21
Lesson preparation and planning	10	3
The methods of lesson presentation used	16	5
The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	12	6
The teacher's standing with the pupils	13	8
The training of the pupils in self expression	15	10

check list to ensure that due regard is given to the major components of teaching performance. It reveals too the fact that unless inspectors are stimulated to consider criteria, they are likely to judge teaching performance on a limited basis resulting in a "halo" effect because the assessment is an indication of the total performance of the teacher. The same conclusion could be drawn with respect to the selection of teachers for administrative posts. This matter is further discussed in Chapter VIII.

Further evidence of the influence of the structured instrument on the thinking of inspectors is provided when responses within a division are compared. With this in mind the responses to the first instrument in the primary division are compared with those made on the second instrument. These are set out in Table XII. Examination of the rank orders reveals that there is considerable variation in emphasis; that is, inspectors would vary their approach to the assessment of teaching performance if they had some guide or check list to assist them in their work. Without this they tend to form an approach derived from experience in the classroom, and this governs their expectations of teaching performance. The fact that the structured instrument has an influence on inspectors' thinking throws some doubt on the validity of an approach which may ignore some of the factors taken into account when brought under the notice of the inspectors. If there are differences between the expectations of the inspector and the teacher these may be caused by the fact that the inspector's image of a good teacher is derived from experience and this may need checking against a list of

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES TO THE TWO INSTRUMENTS
FOR THE PRIMARY DIVISION

Criteria	Rank Order 1st Instrument	Rank Order 2nd Instrument
The methods of lesson presentation used	1	16
Lesson preparation and planning	2	10
Teacher-pupil relationships	3	3
Class control	4	1
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	5	21
The personality of the teacher	6	7
Examination results	7	28
Pupil participation in lessons	8	4
Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry, and self reliance	15	2
The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	18	5
Provision made for individual differences and group needs	10	6
Supervision and checking of written work	19	8

criteria as was the situation when responses to the second instrument were being made.

CHAPTER VII

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HEADMASTER ON THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

It has been established that there are some aspects of teaching performance which do not show up readily under inspection. Yet these factors may be of considerable importance. Such factors as team spirit, punctuality and loyalty were postulated as being significant in a teacher's role and yet were difficult to assess on the inspection of a school. Data were sought on the second instrument relevant to the degree to which inspectors consulted Headmasters in relation to such qualities, and further to list those criteria on which they believed a good Headmaster could make a more sound judgment than could an inspector. In the first instance the critical incident technique was employed to establish whether or not inspectors consulted Headmasters about the total performance of a teacher and to establish those areas in which evidence gained from such interviews influenced the assessment awarded by the inspector.

I. SPECIFIC AREAS OF HEADMASTER INFLUENCE

There is no doubt that inspectors make a point of discussing each teacher on a staff with the Headmaster. In the responses to Part B of the second instrument almost every inspector related an incident in which information obtained from the Headmaster influenced the assessment

of a teacher; in fact fewer than five per cent of respondents failed to report such influence in that they failed to report any such incident. Thus it may be fair to conclude that inspectors generally consult the Headmaster about aspects of a teacher's performance. This kind of statement applies specifically to the primary division where no such discussion is a formal part of the inspection but is left to the discretion of the inspector. In the secondary division, however, it is a duty of the inspector in charge of the visit to schedule such a conference for the express purpose of discussing staff members with the Headmaster.

From the incidents related it was possible to establish the aspects of teaching performance most likely to be influenced by the observations of the Headmaster. Generally they were related to presage criteria and could be consolidated in the following list. Instances were listed when the proposed assessment was altered because the Headmaster commented upon:

1. The teacher's inability to get on well with other staff members.
2. Evidence of an insincere attitude towards the school on the part of the teacher.
3. Doubts about the loyalty and dependability of a teacher.
4. The degree to which a teacher co-operated in the performance of extra duties.
5. The qualities of leadership and example shown by the teacher.
6. Punctuality and consistency of performance as against spasmodic effort on particular occasions, for example, during inspection.

The fact that assessments were amended following the provision of such information lends further emphasis to the postulation that such aspects of a teacher's performance do not really show out during an inspection of a school and thus unless the Headmaster is consulted the assessment is likely to be made on incomplete evidence. It would seem, then, that the inspector can observe some facets of a teacher's role, but it is essential for a more complete evaluation that the Headmaster be consulted and questioned on a number of points relating to a teacher's performance outside the classroom.

II. THE HEADMASTER AND EVALUATION

It has been established earlier that the function of a teacher assessment resides most effectively with the Inspector of Schools. It would appear, nevertheless, that inspectors should consult with Headmasters in order that a complete and thorough assessment is made. In order to gain further evidence of the role of the Headmaster in assessment respondents were asked to indicate on which criteria included on the second instrument they believed the Headmaster could make a more sound judgment than could an inspector. Again a frequency count was made and the results are set out in Table XIII.

To proceed any further with an analysis of data on this aspect of the study reveals that responses fall away rapidly to a point where criteria are listed by only a few respondents.

It is on relatively few criteria therefore that inspectors believe a Headmaster can make a more sound judgment than they. In commenting on

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO VARIOUS CRITERIA ON WHICH A HEADMASTER
COULD MAKE MORE SOUND JUDGMENT THAN AN INSPECTOR

Criteria	Number of Responses	Percentage Response
The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	60	85.7
The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	57	81.4
The teacher's participation and standing in the community	50	71.4
The training of the pupils in civic competence and responsibility	44	62.8
The pupils work well without supervision	37	52.8
The professional activities of the teacher	36	51.4

this section of the study inspectors stated that a Headmaster's experience was too narrow for effective evaluation of teachers; that is, it is necessary to make much wider comparisons than are possible for a Headmaster if standards of teaching performance and evaluations are to be consistent throughout the system. It would appear that inspectors can make these comparisons but that on some particular issues they would be well advised to consult the Headmaster.

One further point was made by respondents to Part B of the second instrument. A considerable number of them pointed out that the extent to which they were impressed by the comments of the Headmaster depended upon two factors:

1. The inspector's own evaluation of the Headmaster.
2. The extent to which they believed the Headmaster was competent to comment; that is, whether or not there was any evidence that he carried out a proper and thorough evaluation of his staff. Some inspectors indicated that this could be ascertained by close questioning of the Headmaster on aspects of a teacher's performance.

CHAPTER VIII

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of this study was to establish whether or not a common body of criteria used in the evaluation of teaching performance could be identified. The study was delimited to the procedures applied by inspectors in the secondary schools division and in the primary schools division of the Education Department of Victoria, Australia. The study was prompted by the view expressed by Ryans¹ that the procedures adopted by those who are charged with the task of teacher evaluation might provide a fruitful area for research into this problem. Already there is a great deal of research and literature covering the subject but much of it is inconclusive and little of it is based on Australian conditions and procedures. In the system under review the assessment of teachers is a task demanded by the system for purposes of promotion through the service and as a basis for the payment of salary increments. To ascertain whether or not there was a common approach to the task of teacher assessment which would be revealed through the identification of a common body of criteria applied by inspectors was the main aim of the study. It was felt that if such a common body of

¹D. G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960).

criteria could be found it would indicate that there was some agreement in the minds of inspectors as to the various factors which go to make up good teaching, as the assessment given is deemed to be a measure of teaching performance. By seeking data from inspectors of schools in Victoria, the study was dealing with responses made by people of considerable experience both as teachers and in the evaluation of teaching performance. Although they spend a good deal of their time in advising and in consultation with teachers, they also devote much time and attention to observation and assessment of teaching performance. There is no doubt that each of them has his own rationale for approaching this task; thus it was seen as being pertinent to this study of teacher evaluation to identify a common approach should one be made by inspectors. This would then be seen as providing a basis for agreement as to what factors could be agreed upon as being symptomatic of good teaching.

Teachers in Victoria receive promotable assessments according to their current performance and this in turn signifies their suitability for work in the next higher class. In some instances this means suitability for promotion to administrative posts and in others for promotion to classroom situations. It was sought to establish whether a specific attempt was made by inspectors to use the assessment to select potential administrators. This would be revealed by variation in emphasis in the criteria applied in each of these situations.

In this connection an attempt was made to examine the emphasis placed on particular criteria or on groups of criteria both for promotion to classroom situations and to administrative posts.

The circumstances and conditions of work in the two divisions under review differ somewhat. Primary inspectors work as individuals and in a prescribed geographical area; secondary inspectors are subject specialists working in a team in the inspection of a school. Further, the secondary inspectors meet as a board and discuss all assessments made before they are confirmed. This is done in an attempt to make comparisons and to remove any injustices which appear to have been caused by the proposed assessment. Even though there are these differences in circumstances the scale of assessments is the same in both divisions. It was part of this study to ascertain whether or not there were identifiable variations in the approach to assessment made by primary and secondary inspectors.

It was postulated that there are a number of aspects of teaching performance which do not readily show up on inspection, but which are quite important in the total performance of a teacher as a member of a school staff. Information, therefore, must be obtained about them if the assessment is to take into account all contributing factors. Generally the Headmaster is the only source of such information, and the study sought to establish the extent to which inspectors consulted the Headmaster and the extent to which they were influenced by his comments when formulating their assessments of teachers. It was also sought to establish the areas or aspects of a teacher's performance on which inspectors were most likely to take notice of the Headmaster's comments.

Two instruments were used in the study. The first of these sought to establish the criteria used by inspectors in their evaluation

of teachers. This was an unstructured instrument, and the data obtained were the summarized considerations made by inspectors in relation to their work in the assessment function. It was reasoned that general agreement in the responses would provide something of a common approach or common body of criteria applied to assessment of teachers by inspectors; wide divergence in the responses would indicate that the approach was subjective and that inspectors had their own individual beliefs as to those factors which go to make up good teaching and that little consensus in the methods of approach was identifiable.

The second instrument contained two parts. In Part A thirty criteria were listed and inspectors were asked to indicate the extent to which they used each of the criteria in their assessment of teachers. This was a structured instrument and was designed to provide data which could be compared with responses to the first instrument, or even combined with them to provide evidence of a common approach to assessment. Consideration of the responses to Part A of the instrument also enabled some study to be made of those aspects of teaching performance most stressed by inspectors.

In Part B of the second instrument the main purpose was to establish the extent to which inspectors were influenced by the Headmaster in making their assessments of teachers and to establish the areas in which this influence was strongest.

II. FINDINGS

Identification of a Common Body of Criteria

This study would seem to indicate that inspectors in Victoria approach the task of teacher evaluation in a subjective manner. It could be concluded that inspectors have their own rationale as to what constitutes good teaching, and little consensus is revealed by the study as to the components of this function. In the unstructured situation presented by the first instrument it was not possible to identify any reasonable number of criteria which were applied with sufficient frequency to be described as a common body or common approach to teacher assessment. On the other hand, when a list of criteria was presented to inspectors, so structuring their thinking somewhat, there was a greater area of agreement as to the factors which ought to be considered when making an evaluation of teaching performance, that is, those factors or criteria which are fundamental to good teaching.

This concentration on the problem of criteria may be misplaced for as Byrne points out:

. . . Each superintendent has developed an image of a good teacher. He has developed as well clues to assist in identifying reflections of this image. His concept of competent teaching and the observable characteristics which for him predict teaching success constitute his professional stock-in-trade. If he is a reasonably shrewd person this sort of conceptualization will guide him well in his task of teacher evaluation.²

The situation as seen by Byrne seems to describe the approach made by

²T. C. Byrne, "Good Teaching and Good Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, No. 5, February, 1962.

inspectors in Victoria as revealed by the data. This could well indicate the need for some kind of guide to be provided for inspectors. The use of such a guide would ensure that at least those factors agreed upon to be fundamental to good teaching would be taken into account in the assessment of teaching performance. However, the question then is pertinent as to who should construct or develop a guide which would be acceptable to all inspectors. This has already been done in some situations and could well provide the basis of a further study for the system under review.

The suggestion has sometimes been made that attention would be more appropriately focused on the learning situation provided rather than on the technicalities of teaching. On the other hand, the criteria listed by inspectors in this study would pay a good deal of attention to those aspects of a classroom situation that sought to bring about the desired learnings. It would seem, therefore, that the learning situation provided is in fact part of teaching performance and is not neglected by inspectors in their evaluation. It might be concluded that the technicalities of teaching and the learning situation provided cannot be considered separately or alone as an approach to teacher assessment. The data obtained in this study would indicate that they are both regarded as important aspects of the total teaching performance.

There is no doubt that inspectors develop their own image of the good teacher but in spite of these differences in approach as revealed in the study, experience in practice indicates that there is much more consensus among inspectors on the final assessment than there is on the

factors which ought to be considered in the making of this assessment. For example, in the secondary division, the whole board of inspectors carries out a review or revision of assessments awarded throughout the inspection period in an effort to reduce subjectivity and to remove any injustices that may have been perpetrated. In these discussions there is a much wider area of agreement than disagreement. It appears, therefore, that it may well be possible for inspectors to place varying degrees of emphasis on a number of criteria relating to teaching performance yet still to reach general agreement on the total performance which is the real issue in assessment. That is, the whole may be more readily recognizable than the parts that go to make it up.

On the other hand this varying emphasis on specific criteria cannot be ignored. It could be speculated that some assessments, for example those denying a teacher promotion, could be made as a result of individual preferences on the part of an inspector. Some responses to the first instrument listed only a few criteria, probably those emphasized by an inspector. It is possible, therefore, that some assessments are made on limited evidence and that a considerable "halo" effect operates. Because a teacher performs well in relation to the emphasized criteria his total teaching performance may be measured in these terms. Since it was observed that some inspectors seem to recognize only a few criteria, some assessments--both high and low--may be improperly based. The implications for teachers and inspectors alike are vitally important. Three specific examples are quoted of responses which list only a few criteria and where these criteria are divergent from the consensus

of responses. In these circumstances teachers are assessed against limited and "unusual" criteria. The data included below to illustrate this point are drawn from the responses to the first instrument; the inspectors concerned would evaluate teachers on these grounds:

Inspector A.

1. The personality of the teacher.
2. The teacher's philosophy of education (the only respondent to list this criterion).
3. The methods of lesson presentation used.

Inspector B.

1. The personality of the teacher.
2. Previous experience as a teacher (rarely listed).
3. Pupil-teacher relationships.

Inspector C.

1. The influence of the teacher on the pupils.
2. The teacher's potential for future Development. (Both of these criteria were rarely listed in the responses.)

Consideration of these three examples strengthens the conclusion that the individual approach to teacher assessment means that some teachers are assessed on limited grounds and in relation to criteria widely divergent from the consensus. This would further emphasize the desirability of some means of keeping before inspectors those criteria generally considered to be fundamental to good teaching. This will not necessarily provide an infallible technique for the assessment of teaching performance nor does it provide a ready answer to the question

of what constitutes a good teacher; this still would seem to depend upon the background of experience and expectations of the observer. Teaching is a complex, multi-dimensional function, and a group or list of criteria covering these dimensions must therefore be an aid in the identification of teacher competence. The use of such a list must broaden the consideration of the inspector, and insofar as some measure of consensus is revealed in the study, it would be appropriate to suggest the use of a written guide for inspectors as an aid to reducing the subjectivity of assessment.

Isolation of Emphasis Placed on Particular Criteria

The evidence obtained in the study would indicate that individual inspectors consider some aspects of the teaching function to be more important than others. The study reveals clearly that in assessing teachers for promotion to classroom situations inspectors are primarily concerned with process criteria. Methods of presentation, classroom atmosphere, the degree of pupil participation and so on are factors which mark out a teacher as being worthy of promotion to a classroom situation. The little stress placed on product criteria in relation to teaching performance indicates the difficulty associated with evaluation in terms of product.

The degree of pupil success in relation to product criteria can only be examined over the long period during which a good many forces exert an influence of which the school is but one. Examination results as a more immediate measure of product received considerable support as a criterion for evaluating teaching competence. The speculation

previously made that lack of emphasis on product criteria may indicate lack of consideration of objectives is a relevant one. The teacher performs in the classroom in relation to a set of objectives either privately developed or imposed. If inspectors are not concerned with objectives it is likely that there will be incongruence between the observed behaviour of the teacher and the expectations of the inspector. To some extent in-service activities and post inspection conferences would tend to reduce this lack of congruence; this emphasizes the need to establish appropriate criteria for identifying teacher competence and for these to be known by both teachers and inspectors. On the other hand, the stress on process criteria as revealed in the study carries the assumption that if a teacher performs well in relation to these then the product will be the desired one.

The selection of teachers for administrative posts, according to this study, required a different set of criteria. In this instance the inspectors relied heavily on presage criteria. In order to differentiate between the groups of criteria to be applied it is necessary that inspectors be aware that in certain circumstances they are selecting teachers for future posts in administration, while in others they are indicating suitability for promotion to teaching situations.

Further, the fact that inspectors apply different groups of criteria in these two instances points up the need for specific selection of those who are to be placed in administration. Otherwise administrators are selected by chance and in respect to an inadequate and partially irrelevant set of criteria; that is, the criteria identified as

being applicable to the assessment of teaching performance only. There is no guarantee that the best teachers will make the best administrators thus the fact that a different set of criteria is applied to each situation must be recognized. Selection for administration as indicated in this study admits the value of classroom performance but includes in addition considerable emphasis on presage criteria.

It is worth noting that in both instances, that is, in relation to evaluation of teaching performance and in the selection of administrators, there was no identifiable variation in the responses because of differences in the age or length of service of the respondents. Further, there was no significant variation due to differences in the qualifications of the inspectors. In fact the more detailed responses to the first instrument frequently came from the recently appointed inspectors. The academic qualifications of the respondents were relatively even; all were in possession of a university degree in Arts, Science or Commerce or the equivalent. In addition, 88 per cent had completed a post-graduate Bachelor of Education degree, of these one held an Ed.D. and two held the M.Ed. degree. The remainder had qualifications in education of lesser standing.

Primary and Secondary Procedures Compared

Consideration of the data obtained in the study revealed that in general terms inspectors in each of the divisions considered base their assessments of teaching performance on process criteria. There were variations in the degree of emphasis placed on particular criteria within this group as shown in Tables VIII and XI, pp. 62 and 65. This could be

accounted for by the different conditions under which inspectors work in each division. Again, it is significant that in the assessment of teacher performance little emphasis is placed on product criteria by inspectors in both the primary and secondary divisions.

The Influence of the Headmaster on Assessment

The belief stated earlier in this study that there were a number of factors in the total performance of a teacher which could not be observed effectively during an inspection was supported by the data. Inspectors indicated that these matters were, as a general rule, discussed with the Headmaster in an effort to gain a total picture of a teacher's performance. In fact, such a discussion is a formal part of the inspection of a secondary school while in the primary division the matter remains at the discretion of the individual inspector.

It was possible to establish those aspects of a teacher's work most likely to be influenced by the comment of a Headmaster; these were all related to presage criteria and were set out in Table XIII, page 72. The area of Headmaster influence was found to be rather limited and when approached from another viewpoint only on six of the criteria listed on the second instrument did the majority of inspectors agree that the Headmaster could make a more valid judgment than they. Nevertheless, it would appear that inspectors agree that the Headmaster should be consulted in order that all aspects of a teacher's work be taken into consideration when making an assessment.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

As a result of the consideration of the data obtained it was possible to draw the following conclusions relative to the practices adopted by inspectors in the assessment of teaching performance in the State Education Department of Victoria:

1. That in the absence of any check list or guide being provided for inspectors, no common body of criteria for the assessment of teaching performance could be identified.

2. That therefore, inspectors approach the task of assessment subjectively and vary in their consideration of those factors which to them go to constitute good teaching. This would indicate the need for the provision of some kind of guide for inspectors, at least indicating those factors which should be taken into account. This need is emphasized by the fact that under the stimulation of the second instrument different criteria were identified and a greater degree of consensus was achieved; enough indeed to form the basis of the suggested guide.

3. In spite of this there is a greater area of agreement than would be expected when the assessment is made. A broad four-point scale such as the one used in the system under review could be the reason for this in that it tends to centralize the variations in approach.

4. Inspectors frequently refer to the "wholeness" of the assessment as being more significant than the parts. This may be due to the fact revealed in the study that little emphasis is placed on the "parts," rather is the whole considered because there is no guide to direct inspectors to the components of the teaching function.

THE HISTORY OF THE

... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...

... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...

... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...

... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...

... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... in the ... of the ...

... of the ... in the ... of the ...

5. Little stress is placed on product criteria in the assessment of teachers both for promotion to classroom situations and to administrative posts. Process criteria emerge as being most important in the evaluation of teaching performance, while for selection of administrators presage criteria together with teaching performance would be the basis upon which judgments would be made.

6. There is, therefore, a need for specific procedures to be applied to the selection of teachers for posts in administration. There is a recognition that particular skills are required in this field, that the best teacher does not necessarily make the best administrator, and specific criteria were identified in the study which should be applied to the selection of administrators. In fact, if this is not done, or if no specific attempt is made to select administrators their appointment is made on inappropriate premises.

7. For proper and appropriate assessments to be made the comments of the Headmaster concerning some aspects of a teacher's role or total performance should be taken into account by inspectors.

8. On very few aspects of a teacher's performance is a Headmaster seen as being able to make a more valid judgment than an inspector as the system operates at present. These must be recognized and the Headmaster consulted about them but generally the assessing function is placed clearly with the inspector. However, a re-appraisal of the function of assessment and modification of assessment procedures may influence this; for instance, the development of techniques of self-evaluation and the role of the Headmaster in such a program may change current behaviour patterns.

9. In view of the possible lack of congruence between the expectations of the inspector and the observed behaviour in the classroom, objectives in various subject areas should be clearly understood by both teachers and inspectors and evaluations should be made in relation to these objectives.

10. In view of the subjective approach made to assessment of teaching performance the question of selection, training, and professional judgment of the inspector assumes vital importance.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study has concentrated upon the assessment function of the inspectors of schools in the Education Department of Victoria; the advisory function and the administrative function of these officers as well as the general effectiveness of their supervision have been ignored in an effort to examine closely the procedures followed in the assessment of teaching performance.

It would appear from this study that some work could be undertaken in the system under review designed to develop a guide for inspectors in their work of teacher evaluation. It would also appear that for a valid assessment to be made and for all factors to be taken into account such a guide is necessary. This need not assume the proportions of a check list, rather does it seem desirable to ensure that certain factors that are important in teaching competence are not overlooked in evaluation.

The compilation of such a guide would have a basis in the criteria identified in this study; these would then need to be tested for

reliability, relevancy and practicability in relation to the system, and for freedom from bias.

The obviously subjective approach made by inspectors as revealed in the study suggests that further efforts in this field would be better directed towards defining adequate selection procedures and training for inspectors of the system rather than in trying to derive an instrument for the objective measurement of teaching performance. Teaching is a complex function and a great many personal variables defy physical measurement; it may be much more worthwhile too, to endeavour to develop a guide for inspectors which would ensure that agreed factors were taken into account when assessments were made. Responses to the second instrument of this study would indicate that some such consensus could be achieved. Regardless of the devices developed there are still the wide personal variables among inspectors to be considered; these would influence any approach to evaluation but a written guide as previously mentioned would at least remove some subjectivity and assessment on limited grounds by ensuring the consideration of identified criteria. Such a guide could still leave room for the individuality of the inspector--it seems to be impossible to divorce the image of a good teacher from the value judgments of the inspector and therefore attempts to derive completely objective measuring instruments seem to be impracticable. Nevertheless, teachers are entitled to some consistency in the approach to evaluation, and it would seem from this study that such consistency is a possibility. The multi-dimensional nature of the teaching function does not deny this; the important thing is that the major

determining factors are taken into consideration.

So long as inspectors take into account the identifiable aspects of teaching performance assessments will tend to be fairly based. Nevertheless, there will still be some personality variables among inspectors. These could be controlled somewhat by consideration of teaching performance in relation to identified criteria, the comments of the Headmaster and the professional judgment of the inspector. The procedures adopted in the selection and training of those who would be charged with the duty of teacher evaluation, therefore, emerges as the fundamental area demanding further study in this field. Extending this a little further, a study could well be undertaken designed to ascertain the factors which lead to the selection of inspectors to fill senior administrative posts within the system and to isolate any particular emphasis on criteria used in the making of such appointments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfaro, J. (1981). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1982). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1983). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1984). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfaro, J. (1981). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1982). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1983). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1984). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1985). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1986). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1987). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1988). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

Alfaro, J. (1989). *El agua en Chile: un recurso limitado*. Santiago: Editorial del Financiero.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, C. C., and S. M. Hunka. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal," Harvard Educational Review, 33:74-95, Winter, 1963.
- Andrews, J. H. M. "The Principal--A Unique Supervisor," The Alberta School Principal, 1959.
- Ball, D. G., K. S. Cunningham and W. C. Radford. Supervision and Inspection of Primary Schools. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1961.
- Barr, A. S. et al. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, 22:169-174, June, 1962; 25:261-269, June, 1955; 28:256-264, June, 1958.
- _____. "Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, 30:150-151, September, 1961.
- Bassett, G. W., A. R. Crane and W. G. Walker. Headmasters for Better Schools. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1963.
- Beecher, D. E. The Teaching Evaluation Record. New York: Educators Publishing Company, 1953.
- Bellack, A. A. (ed.). Theory and Research in Teaching. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1963.
- Byrne, T. C. "Good Teaching and Good Teachers," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, No. 5, February, 1962.
- Castetter, W. Administering the School Personnel Program. New York: Macmillan Company, 1962.
- Downey, L. W. Aims of Education for Today, A paper delivered at the Banff Regional Conference of Urban School Superintendents, April, 1964. (Mimeographed, 20 pp.)
- Education Department, Western Australia. The Functions of a Superintendent of Schools. (Mimeographed, 18 pp.). 1959.
- Getzels, J. W. "A Psycho-Sociological Framework for the Study of Educational Administration," Harvard Educational Review, 22:235-246, Fall, 1952.
- Government of Victoria: Act No. 6240: An Act to Consolidate the Law Relating to Education, 30th September, 1958.

- _____. Act No. 6349: An Act to Consolidate the Law Relating to the Public Service of Victoria, 30th September, 1958.
- _____. Act No. 6391: An Act to Consolidate the Law Relating to the Teaching Service in the Education Department (Victoria), 30th September, 1958.
- Hicks, H. J. Administrative Leadership in the Elementary School. New York: The Ronald Press, 1956.
- Lucio, W. H., and J. D. McNeil. Supervision, A Synthesis of Thought and Action. Toronto: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Mitzel, H. E. "Teacher Effectiveness: Criteria," Encyclopaedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, 1960, pp. 1481-1486.
- Morphet, E. L., R. L. Johns, and T. L. Reller. Educational Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1959.
- Neal, W. D. "The Characteristics of a Good School--A Research Proposal," Australian Journal of Education, November, 1958.
- _____. The Characteristics of a Good School. A paper delivered at the Banff Regional Conference of Urban School Superintendents, April, 1964. (Mimeographed, 21 pp.)
- Nelson, K. G., J. E. Bicknell, and P. A. Nedlund. Development and Refinement of Measures of Teaching Effectiveness. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1956.
- Nichols, L. "A Study of the Methods Used in Canadian School Systems to Evaluate the Efficiency of Elementary Teachers Employed in These Systems." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1958.
- Rose, G. W. "Toward the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, 15:231-238, January, 1958.
- _____. "Performance Evaluation and Growth in Teaching." University of Chicago, 1962. A revision and extension of a paper delivered to the Advanced Administrative Institute, Harvard University, July, 1962. (Mimeographed, 14 pp.)
- Ryans, D. G. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopaedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, pp. 1486-1491.
- _____. Characteristics of Teachers, Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal. Washington: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Tomlinson, L. R. "Recent Studies in the Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Research Bulletin, 34:172-186, October, 1955.

Vander Werf, L. S. How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958.

Worcester, D. A. "The School Administrator's Problems in Selection and Evaluation of Teachers." Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

Worth, W. H. "Can Administrators Rate Teachers?" The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 1, October, 1961.

APPENDIX A

ADVERTISEMENT FOR INSPECTOR OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS

(Extract from Education Gazette and Teachers' Aid, 13th July, 1965).

VACANCY FOR INSPECTOR OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS
(Commercial Subjects)

Applications will be received by the Teachers' Tribunal from persons qualified for appointment as Inspector of Secondary Schools in the Education Department.

Yearly Salary: Man, £3,200 (minimum) to £3,800 (maximum);
Woman, £3,000 (minimum) to £3,600 (maximum).

Duties: Under the Director and the Chief Inspector of Secondary Schools to assist with the inspection of (a) State secondary schools, (b) schools under the Class A system of the Victorian Universities and Schools Examinations Board, and (c) training institutions and registered schools under the Council of Public Education; to furnish such reports as may be required from time to time; to assist generally in the development of secondary education and to carry out any other duties that may be assigned by the Director.

Qualifications: Applicants should possess the following qualifications:-

1. (a) A university degree of approved standing in commerce, preferably with honours.
(b) An approved university degree in education or the Diploma in Education.
2. The personal qualities necessary to fit them for the work of school inspection, and outstanding records as teachers.
3. Successful experience in the teaching of commercial subjects, including shorthand and typewriting. Qualifications for, and experience

in, the teaching of other subjects will be regarded as an asset.

4. A knowledge of the principles and practice of secondary education in relation to the general scheme of education and of modern developments in secondary education.

Applicants should state full name, date of birth, present position, classification, qualifications and experience, and in particular, recent experience in teaching the subjects mentioned above. They should furnish also any particulars or evidence they have to submit in support of their applications.

Applications must be lodged with the Secretary, Teachers' Tribunal, Observatory House, Domain, South Yarra, W.E.1, not later than Friday the 23rd of July, 1965.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

492 Elgar Road,
Box Hill, E.11.

Date.

Dear,

As part of my program in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta in 1963-64 I began a study of the processes employed in teacher evaluation. My work seeks to identify the criteria used by one body of people (our inspectors) charged with the responsibility of evaluating and assessing teachers.

I would be most appreciative if you would complete the accompanying questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience. I should point out that my concern is with classified teachers excluding Headmasters.

I assure you that your individual responses will be treated in the strictest confidence; only the consolidated findings will be reported.

I apologize for intruding upon an already busy schedule but trust that you will find time to set down the information I am seeking.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(Tom Moore)

COPY

INSTRUMENT NO. 1

PART A

1. Your division Primary
Secondary

(Strike out whichever does NOT apply).

2. If secondary, indicate your subject field.

.

3. Experience as an inspector years.

N.B. In making your responses to Part B of the instrument please
consider only classified teachers, excluding Headmasters.

INSTRUMENT NO. 1.

PART B

1. Consider that you are about to award an "Outstanding" assessment to a teacher for promotion to a classroom situation. List below in order of importance to you the factors you would have taken into account.

List of factors in order of importance.

INSTRUMENT NO. 1

PART B (Continued)

2. In awarding an "Outstanding" assessment to a teacher for promotion to an administrative position (Headmaster, Inspector of Schools, etc.,) what factors would you take into account? List these in order of importance to you and include any already listed in (1) which may apply.

List of factors in order of importance.

(Copy)

492 Elgar Road,
Box Hill, E.11.

18th December, 1964.

Dear

On 6th November I sent you a questionnaire relating to some work I have undertaken in the field of Educational Administration. As yet I have had no reply from you so I write to ask if you would be kind enough to let me have your response as soon as possible. I know that you are extremely busy at this time of the year and I apologize for making this extra demand on your time but I would like to work on the consolidation of responses as soon as I can. If you have mislaid the copy of the questionnaire I would be glad to send you another one if you drop me a note.

Thank you in anticipation,

Yours sincerely,

(Tom Moore)

P.S. If you have already forwarded your return please ignore this request.

(Tom).

(Copy)

492 Elgar Road,
Box Hill, E.11.

Dear

Thank you very much for your co-operation in returning the information I sought from you. I now make another and final request in that I would ask you to complete the accompanying questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience. The questionnaire contains a list of factors which may be taken into account in the evaluation of teachers and responses will enable me to determine whether or not a common body of criteria can be identified.

Again, I assure you that your individual responses will be treated in confidence and I apologize for this further intrusion upon your time. May I please have the questionnaire returned by

With all good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(Tom Moore).

INSTRUMENT NO. 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

1. The accompanying questionnaire contains a list of factors which may be taken into account in the evaluation of teachers. Please score all items on Part A of the questionnaire according to the following scale to indicate the importance that each factor has for you in your evaluation of teachers.

- (A) indicates a factor always used.
- (F) indicates a factor frequently used.
- (S) indicates a factor seldom used.
- (N) indicates a factor never used.

Please circle your selected response thus:

- ☒ (F) indicates that the factor concerned is used frequently in your evaluation of teachers.
- ☒ (N) indicates that the factor concerned is never used by you in your evaluation of teachers.

2. On the page reserved for comments please include:

- (a) Any factors always or frequently used by you which are not included on the questionnaire.
- (b) Any comment you care to make on:
 - (i) evaluation of personnel
 - (ii) any further comment you may care to make on any item included on the instrument
 - (iii) any general comment you care to make relating to the study.

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Factors Which May Be Considered in Teacher Evaluation

Marking Key:

- (A) indicates a factor always used.
 (F) indicates a factor frequently used.
 (S) indicates a factor seldom used.
 (N) indicates a factor never used.

<u>No.</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Score</u>			
1.	Provision made for individual differences and group needs	A	F	S	N
2.	Concern with the all-round development of the pupils	A	F	S	N
3.	Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher	A	F	S	N
4.	The degree of self-evaluation of processes employed	A	F	S	N
5.	The teacher's participation and standing in the community	A	F	S	N
6.	Supervision and checking of written work. .	A	F	S	N
7.	Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum	A	F	S	N
8.	The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority	A	F	S	N
9.	Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance.	A	F	S	N
10.	Class control	A	F	S	N
11.	Concern with character development of the pupils	A	F	S	N
12.	Dress and appearance of the teacher	A	F	S	N
13.	The methods of lesson presentation used . .	A	F	S	N

<u>No.</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Score</u>			
14.	The professional activities of the teacher.	A	F	S	N
15.	The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards	A	F	S	N
16.	The pupils work well without supervision. .	A	F	S	N
17.	Pupil participation in lessons	A	F	S	N
18.	The level of intelligence of the teacher .	A	F	S	N
19.	Lesson preparation and planning	A	F	S	N
20.	Examination results	A	F	S	N
21.	The personality of the teacher	A	F	S	N
22.	Teacher-pupil relationships	A	F	S	N
23.	The teacher's standing with the pupils . .	A	F	S	N
24.	The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils	A	F	S	N
25.	The loyalty and dependability of the teacher	A	F	S	N
26.	The training of pupils in self-expression .	A	F	S	N
27.	The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members	A	F	S	N
28.	The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching	A	F	S	N
29.	The use of teaching aids	A	F	S	N
30.	The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility	A	F	S	N

COMMENTS

(See page 1)

APPENDIX C

CRITERIA USED IN THE SECOND INSTRUMENT SET OUT IN CATEGORIES

CRITERIA INCLUDED AT RANDOM ON THE SECOND INSTRUMENT
GROUPED ACCORDING TO MITZEL'S CATEGORIES

A. PRODUCT CRITERIA

1. Concern with the all-round development of the pupils
2. Examination results.
3. The pupils work well without supervision.
4. The development of the process of individual enquiry in the pupils.
5. Concern with character development of the pupils.
6. The training of pupils in civic competence and responsibility.
7. Pupil attitudes of courtesy, industry and self-reliance.
8. The pupils' appreciation of moral and ethical standards.
9. The training of the pupils in self-expression.
10. The attitude of the pupils to the school and to authority.

B. PROCESS CRITERIA

1. Lesson preparation and planning.
2. Pupil participation in lessons.
3. Teacher-pupil relationships.
4. Class control.
5. The energy, force and enthusiasm displayed in the teaching.
6. Supervision and checking of written work.
7. The methods of lesson presentation used.
8. The use of teaching aids.
9. The provision made for individual differences and group needs.
10. The degree of self-evaluation of the processes employed.

C. PRESAGE CRITERIA

1. The personality of the teacher.
2. The dress and appearance of the teacher.
3. Academic qualifications and knowledge of the curriculum.
4. The level of intelligence of the teacher.
5. The professional activities of the teacher.
6. The degree of co-operation by the teacher with other staff members.
7. The loyalty and dependability of the teacher.
8. Qualities of leadership displayed by the teacher.
9. The teacher's participation and standing in the community.
10. The teacher's standing with the pupils.

B29856